THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVI JUNE, 1938 No. 216

EDITORIAL

It is natural this month to write of the Bible, to which great subject some further attention is devoted in articles which follow. The concern of this Journal, as always, is with the region where the life of Churchmen is affected. There is in that region, devotional, intellectual, ethical, one difficult question which many of us have not solved to our satisfaction. It is solved well enough *ambulando* in practice, but it has not been reasoned out. Many of the clergy would find it far from easy to give a clear exposition of their principle in the matter and its application to life and work, and many members of congregations, if challenged, would return either an illogical or an uncomfortable reply. The problem is that of the authority of the Bible.

In general, it is clear enough. The Sixth Article of Religion affirms that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation," and that it also furnishes the standard for determining what shall be counted *de fide*. This we all accept readily, though we are driven, as a living Church, to add to it by taking some account of tradition. The question of the precise authority of tradition has controversial possibilities, but few of us would quarrel with the general position implied in the words of Bishop Ken's will: "I dye in the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly I dye in the Communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papall and Puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross." Here is something which shews clearly that there is more than one way of interpreting Holy Scripture, and that we, for our part, have our way. Another illustration of the relevance and value of tradition is this: in the bare text of the New Testament, "Do this in

remembrance of me" and "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet" look like equivalent commands. How do we know that one is a command to be literally obeyed, and the other is a symbolic reminder of the general duty of humility and service? The answer is an illustration of what we all, even the Plymouth Brethren, owe to tradition.

Tradition is only here mentioned to shew that the question of the authority of the Bible is not so simple as a careless reader of the Sixth Article might suppose. Our point is rather—what is our liberty of criticism? To what extent does the New Testament bind us? We are not thinking of the great doctrinal passages which lie behind the language of the Creed, where the interpretation is naturally obedient; we refer to less fundamental passages, where the interpretation is more free. Must women have their heads covered in church because St. Paul directed that women at Corinth should do so? Is it justifiable to pay no attention to 2 Peter and Jude? Is it right to criticize and even to disapprove the view of marriage which is taken in parts of 1 Cor. vii. or in Rev. xiv. 4? May we repudiate the argument of 1 Cor. ix. 10? May we dismiss Gal. v. 12 as a temperamental outburst, easily intelligible and pardonable because the provocation was great, but not for our imitation? Does Rom. ix. 13 compel us to believe that the Lord hated Esau? Most of us in most of these things claim a considerable liberty.

The habit, which most preachers still maintain, of choosing Biblical texts and preaching "from them" makes hearers think that any verse of the Bible can be assumed to be able to bear any amount of weight. It is true, of course, that "texts" are in point of fact carefully selected, and sermons are not based on such sentiments as *Numquid de bobus cura est Deo?* but on one of the innumerable texts which would bear any weight. But congregations do not always know that. And the outside public, whether friendly, semi-friendly, semi-hostile, or altogether hostile, know it still less. Their comment, if the position of a reasonably critical cleric were to be explained to them, might be, and often is, "Well, all I can say is, if you don't believe that, you ought to." It would perhaps help a little if preachers abandoned "texts," and at the same time preached more expository sermons. This wants doing with some skill. It is fatal to use precious time and blast the souls of congregations with information culled from Smith's *Bible*

Dictionary about the site of Bethabara and the tenets of Pharisees and Sadducees. Even worse is it to betray the dignity of the Bible. There is on record somewhere a Sunday afternoon sermon to men about the healing of Peter's wife's mother. Great play was made of the fact that she was a mother-in-law, and she was constantly referred to as " the old lady." This sort of thing is contemptible. Yet there is a very large place waiting to be filled by Bible sermons.

This would provide a non-controversial way of establishing the authority of the Bible. If preachers clearly have taken their teaching out of the Bible, and if the teaching commends itself to the minds and consciences of hearers, hearers will learn to understand the authority of the Bible. It is the simple fact that the Bible has a way of illuminating human life which is very urgently needed by whose who belong to this generation of human life. Man *is* like that. And God *is* like that. The Bible is right both about man and about God. And preachers would be well advised to concentrate on the task of exhibiting that illumination. It is not necessary very often to expound the meaning of the word " inspiration," but it is constantly necessary to pass on the inspiration which the Bible contains. If there is re-statement, as, of course, there must be, let it be a genuine re-statement, in currency which will command the same credit at the bank of truth. Take a famous passage like Philippians ii. 5-11. A whole course of sermons might be preached on Professor's Dodd's translation of the opening words—" Have the same thoughts among yourselves as you have in your communion with Christ Jesus." The remaining verses of the passage can be re-stated in a course of sermons designed to last from Ash Wednesday to Trinity Sunday. If the preacher has spent some hours each week beforehand on passages from the Gospels which have a bearing on the selected words of the Epistle, and if he can further do the whole thing without using the over-familiar words which will perhaps come naturally into his mind, they will be good and profitable sermons.

From these considerations it would seem to follow that the authority of the Bible, when it is put forward within the life of the Catholic Church and in an intelligent way, will commend itself by its own spiritual force. In dealing with the Old Testament we need have no hesitation in applying our Lord's own method of " It was said . . . but *He* saith." The Duties in the Church Catechism are in fact a valuable illustration of

how it can be done. Nor need we have any hesitation in setting aside an occasional Pauline idiosyncrasy or limitation arising out of the circumstances of ancient life! Delivered in this way from accidental impediments, the Bible will be seen, like the "noble and puissant nation" of Milton's Areopagitica, "rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks . . . while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms."

In Walter Howard Frere, monk, bishop, scholar, musician, missioner, there has passed a rare soul. The austere simplicity of his life never checked the freedom of a rich and full humanity. Rather in him the word of the Lord ran and was glorified. He was a beautiful example of life and thought redeemed and sanctified by grace. R.I.P.

Apologies to Mr. W. Norman Pittenger of New York for that in the April number the word "panentheistic" on p. 208 was printed "pantheistic," and that his argument was thus damaged and indeed reversed. Also on p. 210 for "conceptive" read "conception. A book recently reviewed, *Church Music in History and Practice*, by Winfred Douglas, was misdescribed. It is published by Charles Scribner's Sons, Ltd., at 12s. 6d.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE AS LITERATURE

In one of the loveliest of his books, the ultimate work of his old age, Ruskin tells us that, to his early training in the English Bible, he owed not only a knowledge of the text itself but much of his general power of taking pains, and the best part of his taste in literature. More than two hundred years before Ruskin wrote thus, the great jurist, John Selden, could speak of our version as the best in the world; and in our own day Quiller-Couch has called it as out and away the greatest book of English prose. Macaulay regarded our English Bible as a book which, if everything else in our language should perish, would alone suffice to shew the whole extent and power of that language. Testimonies, equally powerful, could be multiplied; Hallam, Swift, Froude, all bear witness to a book that is noble literature indeed: that, and much more—it is the supreme Epic of Redemption.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to discuss here the historic steps which led to the publication, in 1611, of the Authorized Version of the Bible. It might fitly be termed the Resultant Version, for it is not so much a new rendering as the final result of a process, beginning with Tyndale's translation of the New Testament in 1525, and passing to the Great Bible—exactly four centuries ago—to Cranmer's Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops'; nor do these exhaust the list. Only let us never forget our debt to Tyndale himself, that noble martyr: it is *his* translation which, though so often revised and altered, is substantially the Bible with which we are still familiar. The peculiar genius (to quote Froude's words) which breathes through it; the Saxon simplicity; the præternatural grandeur (unapproached in all attempted versions by modern scholars)—all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, William Tyndale.

No careful student of the English Bible can fail to observe how its phraseology has left a permanent impress on the written and spoken vernacular. So intimately interwoven is its language into the very fabric of our minds that we habitually employ its words, half unconscious that they are, after all, but quotations. Let us take a few by way of illustration. We commonly talk of a man's reaching "a good old age," of earning his bread by "the sweat of his face"; here is one whom we regard as "unstable as water"; another as "after God's own heart"; another as having escaped danger "by the skin

of his teeth." Or we condemn somebody because his heart is "hard as a piece of the nether millstone." The ungodly are reputed to flourish "like a green bay tree," or to be "at their wits' end." We warn a friend that "he that touches pitch shall be defiled," or we may bid him "set his house in order." Newspapers call attention to "the signs of the times"; preachers tell us that "to the pure all things are pure"; we find, in our own lives, what we call "a thorn in the flesh." These are but a handful of sayings, taken at random, which have become part of our mental equipment, familiar to us as the multiplication table. Wonderful indeed that an Oriental literature (for such in origin the Bible is, almost throughout) should have become so universal in its reach, and that the volume where that literature is enshrined holds its place as a great English classic.

We think of the Bible as a book,* and so indeed it is; yet it is much more. It is a Divine Library, made up of many books, the result of generations of effort, composed by men of divers kinds and manners, reflecting in its pages the hopes, the fears, the joys, the sorrows, the aspirations of prophet and priest, of king and peasant, of lawgiver and moralist, of poet and evangelist. There is nothing to match it in the literature of the world. It stands foursquare, braving every wind of criticism, every endeavour to belittle its significance; at once a consolation in distress, the seed-plot of faith, the foundation of our confidence, the imperishable picture of the world's yearning after peace, an image of that divinity which, alike through bright day and solemn night, is perpetually shaping human ends, "rough hew them how we will."

We are only too keenly conscious that great literature is apt to suffer in translation. An exception may justly be made of our Authorized Version. Anyone familiar with, say, the Greek of the Apocalypse can hardly fail to notice how superior, in beauty, in majesty, and in grace, the rendering is to the original. And the same holds good of many other parts of the Bible. The diction of the Authorized Version (formulated at an epoch when our language had, in some ways, touched its zenith) has this strange quality, that it not only communicates ideas but emotions; and it is probable that the singular predominance of Saxon words goes far to bring this to pass. The Fourth Gospel is peculiarly rich in expressions which, for all their vivid directness, their well-nigh monosyllabic

* Yes, and a *traditional* book, as Gilbert Murray points out in his *Rise of the Greek Epic*, chapter iv., and pp. 268 *f*. It is always necessary to remember that the Bible should be read from an Oriental point of view, and not through Occidental eyes alone.

simplicity, possess a secret charm enabling them, again and yet again, to draw aside the veil of the visible, so that we are gazing, if but for one ineluctable moment, on the brightness beyond. Need we search further than the chapter where we hear of the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus, one memorable evening? We are conscious here of something transcending our temporal horizons, and seem lifted not into a visionary region of static Ideas (such as Plato conceived) but into the native land of the spirit itself. We have left all limitations of finitude there, behind us, on the bank and shoal of time: the light of eternity shines in upon us. If the soul of poetry is revealed in its power to evoke transcendental feeling, then the finest things in our version are poetry in an eminent degree.* There is about the phraseology of our English Bible something that, once heard, haunts the memory, waking echoes in the heart that remind us of music over still waters at eventide. The musical possibilities of language stand so revealed that emotion finds, in some mysterious fashion, its appropriate release. Often this magical property of words is found in the simplest expressions. Suddenly a glory is wrung from what might seem but a commonplace, and some plain statement is charged with a new significance. We remember that wonderful passage in Genesis which recounts the doom of Sodom and Gomorrah. It closes thus: "And Abraham gat up early in the morning to the place where he had stood before the Lord; and he looked towards Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the Plain, and behold the smoke of the country went up like the smoke of a furnace." Just a few bold strokes of the brush, and the whole picture becomes vivid, intense, and dark with a mortal warning. Or turn to another chapter where we read of the journey taken by Abraham's servant to bring home a wife for Isaac, his son. The young man has waited many an anxious day for the return of the caravan; and then, late in the afternoon, he appears at the tent door: "And Isaac went out to meditate in the fields at eventide." That quiet pastoral scene, through some word magic we cannot analyze, rises clear before our eyes; we see it all, and understand all, as though we were looking at Millet's Angelus. So, too, with that tenderest of episodes, the story of the walk to Emmaus, with the eager

* Nay, more: at times even the faulty rendering of a verse may convey a pictorial quality denied to a more accurate translation. Here is an example from an early chapter in Isaiah where we read that "every battle of the warrior is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire." A measure of dream consciousness is called forth by such words; they portray no sharply defined image for the mind to grasp, but rather a mood framed in circumstances which match that mood. Eye and ear are allured by some vague fantasia of sound and colour; and so that "transcendental feeling" is induced—by the mere turn of a phrase, the modulation of a cadence.

note of invitation at its close: "Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent." Surely something of the marvel of that twilight picture hovers over these words, touching the soul with an irresistible appeal.

Take the account in Exodus of the discomfiture of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea; with what perfect economy of phrase does the writer bring before us the full terror of that supreme moment! "And it came to pass, in the morning watch, that the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians." Or consider that other picture, where Moses and the Seventy Elders were, for an instant, suffered to catch a glimpse of the God of Israel: "And there was under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness." How brief that transcendent vision, yet intense as some pure flame, burning amid the depths of a darkness unfathomable!

It may be worth recording that a pagan writer of the third century of our era, in a treatise on The Sublime, chose, as a palmary example of sublimity, this sentence from the Proem to Genesis: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; and God said, Let there be light; and there was light." So runs the original fiat of the Creator, majestic in all unadorned simplicity. Nor less majestical are these words from the closing book of the New Testament:

"Hallelujah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth—"

that triumph-cry of victory, sounded from angelic lips, when, "in supereminence of beatific vision, progressing the dateless and irrevoluble circle of Eternity," the ingathered nations shall "clasp inseparable hands, with joy and bliss, in over-measure—for ever."

Let us pass on to the Gospels, choosing a single short passage, where the hand of the artist has been, perhaps unconsciously, at work. In a well-known modern version the verse I have in mind runs as follows: "Look how the lilies grow." Nothing wrong there; just a matter-of-fact observation. But in the Authorized Version, through a touch, a transposition, the change of a single word, the matter-of-fact statement becomes suffused with a new tenderness, filled with a new harmony: "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow." A similar effect is introduced into another saying of Jesus, which reads thus in our Communion Service: "Come unto me all that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you." Beautiful these words are; yet something, something indefinable, seems missing; in our version all comes right, by the slightest change of

emphasis: "I will give you rest." The position of that stop-word "rest" makes the difference, just because, in its exquisite impressiveness at the close, it appears actually to communicate the sense of rest. But passages illustrating the final felicity of some saying or other are almost beyond count. What of these words from that poignant chapter where David learns of his son's death? "And the king said unto the messenger, Is all well with the young man, Absalom? And the messenger answered, The enemies of my lord the king be as that young man is. And the king was much moved, and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept, and, as he wept, thus he spake: O my son, Absalom, my son, my son, Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" Mark the plangent repetitions, the arrangement of the consonants, the twice uttered "O." Yet there is nothing of overcharged sentiment; the Bible is no victim of what Ruskin calls "the pathetic fallacy." Only, through forthright but harnessed expression, we are drawn on to watch the agony wrung from a full heart, now left desolate. Such economy of phrase is particularly striking in the Gospels. Beautiful as are the incidents recorded there, we are conscious of a certain starkness in the descriptions, a spiritual frugality, an artistic thriftiness in the use of words which, far from detracting from the beauty of the story, seem to enhance it. There is no literary verbiage to distract the attention; what we get is the vivid expression of clear thinking, which is the essence of style. And what is true of the Gospels in particular is true of the Bible as a whole. Perhaps no better passage could be taken to demonstrate the artistry of heaven (if I may so call it) than where Elijah, alone upon Horeb, is presented to us as gradually becoming cognizant of the divine presence. "Go forth," came the command to the prophet, "and stand upon the mount before God. And behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains and brake in pieces the rocks; but the Lord was not in the wind. And, after the wind, an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and, after the earthquake, a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire. And, after the fire, a still small voice." That swift change from the noise of warring elements, in all their primeval might, to that other utterance—"soft as the breath of even"—with what an instantaneously solemnizing effect does it fall upon our ears!

Take now that impressive chapter in Isaiah, where the greatest poet among all the prophets of Israel, gathering his singing robes about him, describes, in all the glowing imagery of the Orient, a civilization once devastated but now born anew, and changed into a garden of God, crowned with forest-growths

in all their glory, where none—even the humblest—could lose his way or suffer peril. As a piece of imaginative realism it would be hard to surpass this picture of a realm redeemed, at long last, for the ransomed to inhabit. And observe how, with equal radiance and rapidity, the poet's words—as if transfigured—rise to their climax, only to close in that exquisite coda, made immortal by the music of Wesley: "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. And an highway shall be there, and it shall be called The way of holiness: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein, but the redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Among countless dramatic incidents that meet us in the Bible, let us select three, as exemplifying the skill of their unknown authors to quicken imagination, while at the same time they point a moral. The first shall be from what we may term the Elijah Saga, which appears to have been inserted bodily into the Old Testament narrative. The central scene is laid on Mount Carmel, where, once for all, Jehovah is vindicated as the sole God of Israel. The story is tense with emotion; and the resources of art are employed to heighten it, from the start to the grim finish, where Elijah, towering in solitary might amid the gibbering hosts of Baal, bids the idolatrous priests be put to death. Not less powerful is the record of Saul's last hours when, under cover of night, he steals away on his unlawful errand to Endor, to consult the witch. With a few decisive strokes the chronicler conjures up for us the dreadful scene—the enquiry, the woman's fears and scruples, the unforeseen emergence of the prophet Samuel, with his cohort of attendant spirits from the underworld; and then the final prophecy, and the anguish of the stricken and guilty king. What a picture have we here! Kipling, in one of his later poems, was not slow to seize the implications of the story:

> O the road to Endor is the oldest road,
> And the craziest road of all!
> Straight it runs to the witch's abode
> As it did in the days of Saul;
> And nothing has changed for the sorrow in store
> For such as go down on the road to Endor.

Strangely impressive also is that chapter in the first Isaiah,

where the prophet utters his taunt over Babylon's fallen king—a record written in the rhythm of lamentation. The tyrant monarch who, in his lifetime, had trampled upon whole nations, is now broken; earth is peaceful at last; and suddenly we are led to that dark and dolorous realm of the dead, to witness what has taken place—even the end of all earthly glory. Amid the grisly shadows the once haughty king has become weak as the peoples he had overthrown in the days of his pride. "Hell from beneath is moved at thy coming; it hath raised from their thrones all the kings of the nations to meet thee. All shall speak unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, with the noise of thy viols. How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" The very vowel and consonant sequences here are so cunningly contrived as to serve in heightening the effect. Indeed there is hardly a single device of language that cannot be illustrated from the pages of the English Bible. For instance: how well the author of the book of Job knew (like Milton after him) the splendour that may be lent to a sentence by the use of proper names which, rich in suggestiveness, produce a vague impression of majesty! "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season, or guide Arcturus with his sons?"

Subtle qualities of style are frequently exhibited in the intentional repetition of words. Two instances from the New Testament occur to me. The first is from our Lord's lament over Jerusalem, as with sad commemorative eyes He looked upon the already doomed city: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" It is the double mention of the city's name that gives the added pathos. Similarly in the Apocalypse, where the angel pronounces the fate of another city, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen," the twofold "fallen" intensifies the feeling of tragedy. Not less striking is the thrice repeated "broken," in a famous chapter of Ecclesiastes, reminding us, with its slow mournful iteration, of the tolling of a funeral bell: "Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern."

Mark how a single preposition, through repetition, becomes curiously effective when handled aright, while we bear in mind how easy it is to ruin a paragraph by a clumsy chainwork of weak prepositions, such as "of." Here is a sentence from

Genesis, where we learn that Joseph, now Viceroy of Egypt, has just introduced his aged father to the king. "And Pharaoh said, How old art thou? And Israel said unto Pharaoh, The days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage." I do not presume to analyze the curious felicity of this; but here is the hand of a master craftsman.

Marvels of language are not, however, to be sought for in lengthy verses alone; at times we become aware of them within the compass of half a dozen words. Take the chapter in the fourth Gospel which speaks of the Last Supper, and what do we find? "Judas then, having received the sop, went out; and it was night." I do not know how it may be with others, but I can never read those four final words, so simple, so curt, so unstudied in their directness, without a quickened heart-beat. Verily we are all but amid the gathering glooms of Gethsemane, and the lengthening shadows of the Cross. It is the supreme moment in the spiritual history of the world. All the highways and byways of mankind's agelong record converge on Calvary; from Calvary all the roads of the spirit branch out, from generation unto generation.

Immortal love, for ever full,
For ever flowing free,
For ever shared, for ever whole,
A never-ebbing sea!

Our outward lips confess the Name
All other names above;
Love only knoweth whence it came,
And comprehendeth love.

The more we study the Bible, the more amazed we are at its multifarious character, its full-handed variety. To employ Dryden's phrase, in another connection, "Here is God's plenty." How sharply etched are the main figures in the narratives! We have real men and women, no mere transient and embarrassed phantoms wavering on a background of imaginary story. A solid not a shadowy world is depicted; and the characters within in it move to the rhythm of reality. The old book touches life at so many points; yet always are we conscious of its singular unity in diversity: its messages are many, its message is one—the righteousness of God in its impact on all sorts and conditions of men. Consider, for a moment, what lies before us in its pages. History, in so many of its ramifications, from the distant time when a small Semitic tribe began its memorable career, down to the days of Imperial

Rome; chronicle and biography, genealogical register and ritual ordinance; shrewd maxims and homely precepts that, sifted by unknown sages, have gathered within them half the wisdom of the East; hymns and spiritual songs whose sound has gone forth into all the earth; ballads, like that of Deborah; fable and fragments of early myth,* whose origins go back to an immemorial antiquity; folklore, such as for centuries had been rehearsed round bivouac fires in many a pastoral encampment; the voice of prophecy (loftiest example of Israel's religious genius) proclaiming for ever the moral law; enactments of legislators, like Moses; weird Apocalyptic dreams, wherein writers, whose very names are unrecorded, wrought out their philosophy of history; collections of letters—themselves, in their variety and human interest, a priceless heritage; panoramic presentations of mighty events, past, present and to come; a secular love song, bright with all the opulence of the Orient; a precious lyric in praise of that divine love which, in its bequeathed peace, is greater than faith or hope; oratory, noble and sincere, such as meets us in the Acts of the Apostles; dirges, too, for the dead, and hymns of victory. Then there are idylls, like the book of Ruth; discourses and allegory, sermons and parables, to say nothing of what in Hebrew is termed *haggādah*—that is, tales and anecdotes, like Esther or Jonah, devised to illustrate some point in the Law, or to enforce some moral lesson. Even legend is utilized, where desirable, on the exact principle that fiction of the right sort has its due place in the divine education of the race. Nor has drama been neglected; the book of Job—one of the most impressive things in the whole of the Old Testament—is there to assure us. Philosophy in the strictest sense (at least as we know it in the Metaphysics of Aristotle or in certain of the dialogues of Plato) is no feature of the book; and comedy, as the Greeks fashioned it, finds no place, though it need not be denied that the comic spirit is at work in certain incidents of the Samson Saga. Neither philosophy nor pure comedy appealed to the Semitic intelligence; and it may well be that Semitism—its beginnings cradled amid the vast desert spaces—recoiled from the breath of the comic spirit, which has, to be sure, little communion with those ideas of righteousness and holiness which are the master-light of an Epic of Redemption. The spirit of Hebraism made compensation for its lack of metaphysical interest by its

* Myth—simply a story told, and then the feeling it calls forth and regulates. Myth, like poetry and parable, may convey religious teaching even more effectively than bare historic narrative. Why deny the presence of myth in Scripture, if it be a presentation of truth about life, but in dramatic guise, so that it becomes a focus of emotion and loyalty? Probably all ultimate truth in religion tends to take on this form, as Plato believed.

profound ethical seriousness. Hebrew thought was unspeculative in character; it never contemplated a system of ratiocination or of logic, but rather a guiding principle for common life. What the Bible is primarily concerned with is not so much the development of the intellect, as the vital needs of the soul, the discipline of the will. Its authors—to employ Plato's superb phrase—beheld Time as a moving image of Eternity. "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

In our own day, and long before it, skilled investigators have busied themselves with trying to reach conclusions on the dates and authorship of the Scriptures. The results of an intensive criticism have not left traditional views unchallenged, any more than Homeric criticism has left undisturbed the traditional views of the Iliad and the Odyssey. This was inevitable. But nothing that critics have essayed can displace the two venerable Testaments from the position they have always held in the annals of mankind. There they abide—the chronicle of a revelation to man, the earthly channel of a heavenly purpose, the very scaffolding of the spirit. And while we are in duty bound to put first things first, we do ill to minimize the *beauty* of the Bible regarded as literature; the neglect of this side is a luckless legacy from a false and joyless Puritanism which, in its zeal for the holy, forgot that element of beauty which is a complementary part of the divine order. But the instinct for beauty is not absent from the divine library, the writers of which knew well that poetry*—to name only one element in the category of the beautiful—may itself become an illumination of the spirit. Else why were so many portions of the Bible composed as poetry, and not prose? Are we not bidden to worship the Creator in the *beauty* of holiness? Are we not encouraged to believe that, in the fulness of time, we shall behold the King in His *beauty*? Beauty, then, is as essential an element in the divine as any other of those attributes we are wont to assign to it. Is not the glory of the visible universe here to remind us of this inescapable truth?

Ought it to appear strange that the divine delight in mere physical beauty (which reveals itself alike in the starry heavens above and in the wayside flowers at our feet) should find

* In one of John Donne's Sermons are these words written: The pencil of the Holy Ghost, in inditing the Scriptures, "delights not only in a propriety, but in a delicacy, harmony, and melody of language; with height of metaphors and other figures, which may work greater impression upon the readers." And he goes on to call attention to St. Bernard's effort "to exalt diction from the melodious fall of words." As a celebrated preacher of the seventeenth century, Robert South, remarked: "There is a certain bewitchery or fascination in words which make them operate with a force beyond what we can naturally give an account of."

manifestation in the linked syllables of human speech? No: there is deep underlying beauty in the varying devices and subtle suggestiveness of language. Mark how it emerges from some jewelled utterance, formed oftentimes of the quietest words: "For with Thee is the well of life, and in Thy light shall we see light." Simple, this, as the speech of a little child, yet pregnant as the deliverance of a seer.

With what a wistful tenderness, with what an exquisite note of welcome, come these tranquil words across the gulf of ages: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with Me." Take these other words, twice repeated, thrilling (as they do) with some cosmic emotion: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands; they shall perish, but Thou remainest; they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou change them and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail." Sounds indeed are these, that fall upon the ear like whispers from another world.

So we discover that language has its proper share in the beauty so lavishly bestowed on the visible creation—"this mighty sum of things for ever speaking"—and, from it, reflected in the manifold works of artist and musician. Gracious is that verbal witchery by which masters of word music may transmute the commonplace into something invested with a rich and rare appeal, even as the glass of a painted window melted in the sun has power to transmute the clear sunlight into all the glowing colours of a rainbow. Chiselled phrase and luminous word—these are registered for ever, incapable of stain as of decline.

No one, whose soul is not closed to the glory of words, can doubt that Jesus was conscious of this; His sayings are often steeped in the imagery of a poet; it is only our familiarity with them that tends to obscure this fact. He uses language as a poet, with conscious artistry. True, He was a street-preacher in the days of His flesh; He employed familiar words to convey His meaning; but, while so doing, He lifted the idiom of the mart to a loftier plane. Hence His words, like the cadence of a silver bell, live and intercede with us still, just as they did when first spoken by the shores of Gennesaret, or in the throbbing heart of Jerusalem, two thousand years ago.

Can we doubt it? Examine, for one brief instant, the pages of the Gospel. Is there no artistry, serene and beautiful, in the parable of the Prodigal Son—surely the best short story in existence? On His lips the commonplaces of language turned

to an enduring music; they cease to be mere prose. And what of the half-century of metaphors to be found in the Sermon on the Mount? He loved beauty—loved it because, for Him, it bore the sign-manual of the Creator. Flowers and birds and trees; familiar sounds and scenes of everyday existence; mountain summit, grass-green slope; animal life; the heavens above and the earth beneath; sunshine and storm on the lake—yes, things trivial enough, yet, beneath His inimitable touch, apparelled with a celestial significance, "beyond the reach of chemic test." Then, too, His humour, so delicate in its sweet reserve; His irony, at once so fine and so piercing in its mingled gentleness and severity. What is the net result of all these qualities of mind and spirit? Surely, literature of a kind unequalled in its quiet loveliness and power. Even the men of His own day marvelled at the gracious words that proceeded out of His mouth, exclaiming, "Never man spake like this man."

It may be that the beauty of recorded sayings is even more beautiful today than when first written. They come to us enriched and ennobled by the lives of those who have found strength and consolation in their loveliness. The thoughts and hopes of generations seem to find an abiding place there, in all grace of unwounded age. Is it but an idle fancy that the prayers and promises of long ago have so incorporated themselves in the Church's earthly mansions of marble, that they seem to haunt, as it were, though now silent, those aisles and arches where once they echoed to the sound of harp and organ? Similarly with passages we once learned, perhaps, at a mother's knee, messages of eternal significance that have been slumbering beneath the threshold of consciousness, and now stir into renewed activity; phrases we have loved long since and lost awhile; they well up at some unforgettable crisis in our lives, hallowed by remembrance, or made more beautiful by Death. They have become for us permanent possibilities of a spiritual renewal, treasured up unto a life beyond life.

How often, it may be during a solitary walk, or in the thronging hours of business, or in the silence of the night sessions, there will steal in upon us echoes from those records of the buried past, which linger with a strangely solemn appeal! We are passing, perhaps, by some quiet churchyard, and then, suddenly, the old words are filled with a new meaning: "A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday, seeing that is past as a watch in the night; behold, we bring our years to an end as it were a tale that is told." Or we are rising once more to the day's recurrent duties, and with what shall the morning proclaim them? "Man goeth forth to his work and

to his labour, until the evening." It was the text Newman took for his first sermon at St. Mary's; and it was from the self-same text that he preached his farewell. It may chance, from time to time, as we pause on life's uncertain journey, that there flashes upon us the splendour of a sudden thought: "The pathway of the just is as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Even so, "until the day break and the shadows flee away." In our noble English Bible, that rich treasury of devotion, you will not look in vain for some word of swift deliverance, some message breathing heroic hope, and justice, and wisdom, and patience, and a love unfeigned.

Sometimes, as I stand upon the field of recollecting thought, I try to picture the Bible as a majestic tree, its roots deep-set in the ground, its branches like the cedars of Libanus, goodly and full of sap, spreading far to the north and to the south and to the east and to the west; and the leaves of that tree are for the healing of the nations.

E. H. Blakeney.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, AUTHORISED AND REVISED

"Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising any thing ourselves or revising that which hath been laboured by others . . . findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcommed with suspicion in stead of love, . . . and if there be any hole left for cavill, (and cavill, if it do not find a hole, will make one), it is sure to be misconstrued. . . . Was there ever any thing projected that savoured any way of newnesse or renewing, but the same endured many a storm of gain-saying or opposition ?"

This challenge comes from the spirited preface "To the Reader," which the translators of 1611 prefixed to their work. (Unfortunately the printers usually leave it out.) These translators were in fact Revisers of the work of other men, and so had to bear the reproach that they were altering the English Bible. To-day when we consider the case of the Revised Version of 1881 we find that History repeats herself, and it is well for us to remember that the Revised Version of 1611 had to be defended in its own day for its "newnesse." Much of the hostile criticism of our present Revised Version springs from mere distaste for the unfamiliar. Moreover the newness of the R.V. is grossly exaggerated by its opponents. Take just one example. There are several good corrections in the Revised

Version of Luke xv. 11-32 ("The Prodigal Son"), but the happy style of the sixteenth century is retained. The R.V. is a true advance on the A.V.: witness the following instances out of many.

(*a*) Mk. ii. 17=Matt. ix. 13. Our Lord sitting at the table of Levi (Matthew) is blamed for eating with publicans and sinners.

According to Lk. v. 32 (also Mk. and Matt., A.V.) our Lord answers, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners *to repentance*." It is true that on other occasions Jesus called men *to repentance* (Mk. i. 15), but He was conscious that His mission extended further than this; indeed He knew that He came to call men of every race to "sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. viii. 11). Surely He held this larger vision as He sat at meat in Levi's house with publicans and sinners. This is what the W-H text, followed by the R.V., implies in Matt. ix. 13=Mk. ii. 17, "I came to call sinners"; for in these two passages the additional words *unto repentance* do not occur in the most ancient MSS. On this occasion in Levi's house our Lord is not thinking of terms of admission: He is content to proclaim against the narrow Pharisees the general truth that He has come to call, to invite, sinners into the kingdom of heaven. The stress lies on the extension of mercy to those who were not Pharisaically "righteous."

(*b*) Two noteworthy changes in the R.V. due to the discovery of an earlier and better text of the Greek are found in 1 Cor. xiii. 3 (margin), and in Rev. xxi. 24. In 1 Cor. xiii. the Apostle gives us not a mere exercise in rhetoric, but a remembrance of his own experiences and an outpouring of his inmost heart. In verses 1-3 and again in verses 11, 12 it is "I, I, I." In verse 3 he writes, "If I give my body, that I may glory" (R.V.), and in these words there is a clear allusion to those sufferings for the Gospel which are fully described in 2 Cor. xi., specially in verses 24, 25. There he reveals the fact that of the Jews *five* times he received forty stripes save one, and that (by the Romans) he was *thrice* beaten with rods. Thus on eight occasions he "gave his body" to this form of torment. (He might naturally "glory" after being beaten thus.) But in 2 Cor. xi. he apologizes earnestly for "glorying" in this Confessorship for Christ. He "gloried" only because those who denied his Apostleship made a "glorying" over their own smaller sufferings in order to exalt themselves against him. So in 1 Cor. xiii. 3 he apologizes for mentioning his beatings ("that I may glory"), and declares that they count for nothing, if he has not also love.

In the A.V. the double reference to St. Paul's own experience of stripes, and to the necessity put upon him of boasting over them, is lost. "Though I give my body to be burned" (A.V.) puts an imaginary case, while the true reading of the Greek alludes to that which the Apostle actually suffered. The margin of the R.V., "If I give (or "gave") my body" (as he did on eight occasions) "that I may glory," represents the ancient text restored to us by W-H. That text in general has been amply vindicated by recent discoveries, and, in the case of 1 Cor. xiii. 3, by the reading found in "Papyrus 46," which scholars date A.D. 200-250.

Rev. xxi. 24 deals with the purpose for which the Church exists. It is well known that she exists to be the nursing mother of her members, and also in order to "make disciples of all the nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19, R.V.). But there is a third purpose which is not so generally understood. Isaiah, speaking of the Church as she existed in pre-Christian days in the form of the Israel of God, declares God's will that she is to be "a light to the Gentiles" (*goyim*, Isa. xlix. 6). This does not necessarily mean that the Gentiles will all accept Judaism. There was (and is) an intermediate stage between the state of heathenism and the condition of absorption into the kingdom of God. The Divine work moves in stages. The prophecy points to a state of things which resulted from the wide dispersion of Israel in the sixth, fifth, and following centuries B.C. Not only were proselytes gathered into Judaism in many countries, but in addition to this the witness of Israel to the truth of Monotheism and to the need of a higher standard of morality acted as a light-bearer in many nations. It gave moral support to thoughtful Gentiles, who, being without the written Law, followed the law which spoke within them (Rom. ii. 14, 15).

These facts help us to interpret such a passage as Rev. xxi. 24, for the Revelation is full of thought and imagery derived from the O.T. The verse in the R.V. is, "And the nations shall walk amidst the light thereof"—*i.e.*, the light of the City of God. The nations intended are just the nations of Isa. xlix. 6—*i.e.*, the nations in general. The kingdom of God on earth must show to the kingdoms of this world the light of a heavenly example. This lesson is drawn from the R.V., which has again followed the correct text of the ancient MSS.

But here the A.V. follows the intrusive gloss of late MSS., and so restricts the light of the Holy City to "the nations *of them that are saved*." These only "shall walk amidst the light thereof." But the R.V. has come in time to teach us better. The Church of God of to-day must let her light shine before

the nations of Europe—aye, before the nations of the world.

This paper may fitly close with a reference to Bp. Westcott's book, *Some Lessons of the Revised Version* (London, 1897). In this work of 239 pages the Bishop has classified a great number of the changes, and has pointed out their significance. Thus on pages 147 *f.* he gives an interesting selection of changes which bring back into the Bible traces of temporal or local colouring which are lost in the A.V. In Matt. xxvii. 15, "The governor was wont to release unto the multitude *one* prisoner." John xxi. 12, "Come and *break your fast.*" (The words were spoken "when day was now breaking," verse 4). Acts xix. 35, "The city of the Ephesians is *temple-keeper* of the great Diana." Acts xxii. 28, "With a great sum obtained I this *citizenship*" (*i.e.*, citizenship of Rome).

Above all the Bishop shews that the R.V. by careful renderings presents more clearly some of the great truths of Religion. The truth "of the mystical union of the believer with Christ finds its simplest and most complete expression in the Pauline phrase "*in* Christ," which is itself a full Gospel. "This phrase, it will be felt at once, corresponds with the formula of Baptism, *We were baptized* into *the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost* (Matt. xxviii. 19, R.V.), and in virtue of that act we are "*in* Christ."

"The phrase . . . has been frequently rendered with exactness in the A.V.; but in many memorable passages it has been obscured to the great loss of the English reader. When for example we read in Rom. vi. 23, *The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord* (A.V.), we recognize a general description of the work of Christ, of what He has wrought for us, standing apart from us. But all is filled with a new meaning when the original is closely rendered: *The free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord* (R.V.). Life is not an endowment apart from Christ: it is Himself and enjoyed in Him." Three times in one chapter (Phil. iv. 7, 13, 19) the *in* of the R.V. is better than the *through* of the A.V. The first passage is, *The peace of God which passeth all understanding shall guard your hearts and your thoughts* in *Christ Jesus.*

Readers who really desire to wring from Scripture its secret truths will not disdain to pay even to prepositions their due.

W. Emery Barnes.

THE PENTECOSTAL GIFT

THERE are some problems in theology about which the agnostic is not alone in being dubious; and perhaps chief among these is the ancient dictum *Nulla salus extra Ecclesiam*. For it is probably true to say that, while the universal Church teaches this doctrine as being in some sense true, the literal sense in which it was held for so many centuries is now totally dead. The most ultramontane Roman Catholic or hard-baked Presbyterian Calvinist would no longer deny the ultimate salvation of the atheist who lived in good faith and good works; but it is essential for a member of the Catholic Church to believe that the Church is the Ark of Salvation, the ordained mediator of supernatural grace and the home of the Holy Spirit in a quite unique sense, if the Church is not to possess a merely utilitarian value.

It must become more and more difficult for the Churchman to vindicate his position as such in the eyes of the world if he is not prepared to say that there is all the difference between one who is a baptized member of the Church and one who is not; and this problem goes deeper than that of salvation. There is the problem of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and I think that this problem is the crux of the whole matter. For if we believe that at Pentecost the Holy Spirit came upon the Church, and that His Presence has been handed on through the Apostolic Succession to succeeding generations, then we must accept as at least reasonable, if not actually self-evident, the position from which the Church is regarded as the true mediator of Divine Grace, the Ark of Salvation and the only true home of all Christians.

That is a perfectly consistent and logical view, once the unique nature of the Pentecostal gift is allowed; but the Churchman who is honest is still left with the staggering manifestations of the work of the Holy Spirit outside the Church. In the ancient philosophies of Greece, the modern discoveries of Science, the Hebrew prophets and the great artists of all ages, the work of Grace has been going on. He Who descended with His sevenfold gifts upon the Church is also He Who is " the Lord and Giver of Life " and " Who spake by the prophets " before the birth of the Christian Church at Pentecost, and this is the orthodox teaching of the Universal Church. It is true that our Lord said of St. John the Baptist that " he who is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he," but none would deny the presence of the Holy Spirit in John the Baptist—operating through supernatural Grace.

Is it therefore a cause for wonder that men inside and outside the Church, instructed or uninstructed, are a little puzzled and bewildered by the problem of Church membership? I am not speaking without the book when I say that this claim of the Church to a monopoly of the Holy Spirit does much to bring discredit upon her—particularly as she is seldom at pains to reconcile this with her own doctrine of the Spirit's universal presence.

It cannot be denied that there is good sense in the blunt assertion of the type of man which I have in mind. He would say that the Church may be the Ark of Salvation, the mediator of Grace and the home of the faithful—a belief that is at least logical in view of her claim to be an extension of the Incarnation through the gift of the Holy Ghost. That is at least logical; but, since she has been forced to admit that Grace was often manifested outside her walls, that God has revealed Himself to mystics, saints and scientists, who were not of her body, and that she has deliberately adopted modes of thought which come from pagan sources, the claim must be abandoned. That is a perfectly fair challenge which I am sure we must endeavour to meet if we hope to convince the growing generation of our sincerity.

Now I think that there are some members of the Church who fall quite justly under the censure of these people. They are the Churchmen of whom the present Archbishop of York once spoke of as regarding the Church as a box that opened and shut only to admit or expunge its members. To them you are either inside or outside; and, while inside all is light, outside all is darkness. There are some quite intelligent people who take this unfortunate view of the Church of Christ, and such are easily vanquished by the argument just propounded; but there are others who, like the late Baron Von Hügel, take another view of the Church. These regard it as a great light of which our Lord is at the core—a light that gradually shades off into darkness. The Christian Church comes in the centre of this light—which shades off by degrees through the various religions of the world—some of them lighter than others—until it shadows out into the total blackness of heathendom.

This conception of the Christian Church acknowledges various measures of light in religions which are outside its circle; but it must be qualified if we are to meet the challenge of those who say that, on such a shewing, there is no need for membership of the Church of Christ. Such a critic would probably claim that there have been Buddhists and agnostics who have manifested more of the light than certain baptized Christians—that Gandhi and George Eliot displayed more

evidence of the Holy Spirit's influence than Cæsar Borgia or even Charlemagne. That is, perhaps, the chief complaint of the average layman who refuses membership of the Christian Church; and, though it is often stated crudely, it is a fundamentally sound one.

It is for the Church to shew why, in spite of the fact that a greater measure of the Holy Spirit seems to be granted to some outside her Body, membership of that Body is insistently demanded; and what is the special Presence of the Holy Ghost which she claims for herself in view of the fact that outside her there are those whose fruit in good life and good works, and sometimes in great personal holiness, bears testimony to the presence of that same Spirit. When St. Paul spoke of the diversity of gifts bestowed upon men by the same Spirit, it is almost impossible to suppose that he had only baptized Christians in mind; but rather the whole Jewish world—if not actually the pagan world as well.

Now I think that if we are going to consider the birth of the Church in the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the first thing that must strike us is that this coming was different in nature from any record of His manifestations in the New Testament. Indeed, it is now universally admitted among New Testament scholars that the Holy Ghost was not recognized as a Member of the Trinity until long after Pentecost—the Trinity itself being a rather later development of theology. The Spirit of God was realized to exist in individuals; but the notion of the Spirit as a Person in the Godhead was no doubt largely the result of the Pentecostal miracle. It is, however, the Spirit of God rather than the Holy Spirit which predominates in the earlier theology; and any who remember how suddenly we come upon something quite new in the experience of Whitsun Day will find no difficulty in realizing how easily such an event might constitute a crisis in theology.

The most striking difference between this and most other experiences which preceded it is surely the *corporate* nature of the Pentecostal experience. It is impossible to know how far there was a corporate consciousness in the Apostolic band before Pentecost because the Gospels, in which we hear of "the Twelve" or "the disciples," were compiled many years afterwards; but there can be no doubt whatever of the corporate aspect of the Church from the moment of Pentecost onward. The Twelve became as One; and, though there were sometimes personal differences within the band, its corporate nature was assumed and its corporate mind made the foundation stone of Christian thought and teaching.

It may be argued that St. Paul was an independent thinker

whose thought created a crisis in Christian theology; but this speculation assumes far too much knowledge of the shaping of Christian thought in the dark womb of which we have so little knowledge. It is fairly evident that St. Paul had such confidence in Apostolic teaching that he could speak of what he had learnt from the Apostles as " from the Lord "; and that, as on the occasion of his advice about Christian marriage, he was very anxious to distinguish between advice that he was giving of himself from that which he had received as of Christian tradition from the Apostles, which he considered to be " of the Lord." The idea of St. Paul as a revolutionary Christian thinker generally disappears on a deeper knowledge of his works; and is discredited by the fact that he seems to have been dedicated, by Apostolic authority, the special charge of the gentile Christians.

This corporate consciousness of the Christian Church from Pentecost onwards is of the greatest importance in estimating the nature of the Pentecostal gift. For the Holy Spirit came, on this occasion, not to any as an individual, but to all alike. There is no hint in the account of the experience which comes down to us that anyone was endowed with a greater measure of that Spirit than any other; but all alike received the same gifts necessary for the Apostolic Ministry. The band was no longer one of men who held together simply in a common cause, or even as disciples of the same Leader, but as one Body united by a power from on high.

From henceforth it might fairly be said that the Holy Spirit operated in two senses. His operation could be observed in the manifold gifts of men and He was observed to operate in the Church as the Spirit that was its mainspring. There is, of course, a third and unique occasion on which the Holy Spirit may be said to have operated at the moment of the Incarnation; but, in the affairs of mortal men, there were recognized these two activities of the Holy Spirit—the one individual and unlimited in its scope and the other corporate and bounded by the confines of the Catholic Church. This corporate coming of the Holy Spirit has always been regarded by the Church as an extension of the Incarnation and the means whereby the Presence of Jesus Christ, guaranteed by Himself, is preserved and perpetuated in His Church on earth.

This doctrine of the corporate presence of the Holy Spirit in the whole Church, as distinct from its individual members, is a great safeguard against all magical or mechanical interpretations of the priesthood; and if it had been more generally held in some ages of Church history, abuses might never have reached the dimensions which they actually did reach. For

the whole sacramental system, in the light of this notion, assumes a corporate significance; and any idea of a priestly caste is therefore rendered unnecessary. All the operations of the Holy Ghost in the Church must be regarded as corporate in the light of such a faith; and this belief does much to mitigate the growth of superstition.

This means that the whole Church, not the individual priest alone, is the consecrator at the Eucharist—the whole Church ordains bishops, priests and deacons to their respective offices, baptizes infants and seals baptism with confirmation. The priest or bishop who performs the rite must be regarded as the chosen instrument ordained by the same whole Church to that office; but it is the whole Church who, from the consecration of a Bishop to the absolution of a congregation, is operating. There would, I think, be far less objection to such doctrines as the Apostolical Succession, the validity of sacraments and the threefold Ministry, if this corporate aspect of these gifts and responsibilities was unflinchingly kept in view.

This doctrine has, of course, been held in the best ages of the Church and is that taught by the primitive Fathers; but it is seldom, at least in popular theology, related to the Pentecostal gift as a corporate coming of the Holy Spirit Who must henceforth act in a corporate, as well as in an individual, manner. For, from the first Whitsun Day until the end of Time, the Christian believes that where or when the whole Catholic Church is in agreement or united action, the Holy Spirit is the Voice that speaks or the Arm that acts. He may regard one branch of the Church as the whole Catholic Church or he may mean the great historic Church, the whole company of Christian people throughout the world. What is important is the fact that he regards the whole Church as something that acts as a single power to which the individual members make their contribution.

Now one of the principal characteristics of the Church, when conceived as a corporate Body, is the fact of its growth; and this, I maintain, constitutes strong evidence for its necessity in the salvation of the world. For the Church is a growing Body—as indeed our Lord prophesied that it must be, in the parables of the mustard seed and of leaven in the lump—and this corporate presence of the Holy Spirit is therefore for ever widening. It was born a seed in that Upper Room at Pentecost; but must go on developing through the ages—gathering all nations and all the manifold branches of thought, art and knowledge into its fold—until it flowers into the Church Universal throughout the world. Each one baptized into its body is a new cell of life; and if it seems to have lost in power

since the days of its narrow concentration upon so few, at least we may believe that it is growing in abundance and the rich treasure of souls.

This surely gives a new meaning to the blunt and often misunderstood slogan *Nulla salus extra Ecclesiam.* For these words of the great St. Cyprian need not be interpreted as meaning that no individual is saved outside the Church. In the light of this argument, and the conception of the Church as a corporate body, it more naturally means that there is no salvation for the world outside the Church; and that, but for the supernatural Grace administered corporately by the Church to all her members, and the gradual incorporation of the whole world into that membership, there could be no ultimate salvation for mankind. History would have gone on repeating herself in the growth and collapse of civilizations who had glimpses of the vision of God, but who remained unempowered by the coming of His Presence to overcome, in Newman's words, " in man for man the foe."

The Church claims, in this corporate sense, to be the extension of the Incarnation through the power of the Holy Ghost, and every man, woman or child baptized into the Church, takes his or her share in this gradual redemption of mankind. In this sense the Church may be called the Ark of Salvation; but in no other. It is, we believe, the centre of the light to which our Lord Himself provides the core—the only full and complete light known to mankind; but all that is outside is not total darkness. The worst that the Christian can say of those beyond this inner circle of light is that they share the light to greater or lesser degrees; and that they are necessarily excluded from participation in the corporate Body that is alone the hope of man's salvation. It is therefore nearer the truth to speak of the Church as the centre of light than as a box—of which a person must be either on the inside or on the outside.

This presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church does, however, give the Church an entirely unique value *as a body.* For there is no other body in the universe which can claim to be supernatural in the whole while only natural in the parts. It is an axiom of thought that the whole of any given object is something more than the sum total of its parts; but the Church of Christ is the only body in the world that claims, as a result of the Pentecostal gift, to be *different in kind* as a whole from what it is in the parts. For it claims, as a whole, to be the Body of Christ in the sense that it is the instrument of His Spirit; and upon this belief is based the Church's claim to be a teaching Church.

The problem of ecclesiastical infallibility is one that demands a discussion to itself; but the reasonableness of this claim should be noted at this point because it is, in a sense, the logical conclusion of my argument. The objections to infallibility are generally based upon the fallible material upon which it must rely. It is argued that, so long as the minds of men are fallible they cannot be expected, either individually or as a body, to reach any conclusion that can be relied on as infallible; but the conclusion that this argument reaches is necessarily opposed to the view that the Church, as a whole, can be regarded as merely a collection of individuals. It is of the essence of this argument to realize that the Church as a corporate unity is a Divine organization possessing Divine Light and that it cannot be regarded as a purely human institution.

The nature of the Church's authority must be discussed in the light of the authority of our Lord—if we are to regard the Church as the Body of Christ. For all Christians believe that infallible truth came into the world with Jesus Christ and that He spoke the Truth to mankind as it has existed in the Mind of the Father from all eternity. It is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that, if the Church is an extension of the Incarnation, then those qualities which are essential to the Incarnation must be inherent in the Church. I do not claim, of course, that such an argument is unanswerable, and readily acknowledge that it is here only baldly stated owing to the limitations of space imposed upon me; but I maintain the *fact* of the Church's infallibility, in a corporate sense, is implicit in the conclusion that this argument reaches.

This same argument, however, denies by implication that the Holy Spirit can work in any other body *as a body*. He can, as indeed I sincerely believe He does, inspire individuals both inside and outside the Church—among artists, physicians, scientists and thinkers of all kinds—but this does not vouchsafe a supernatural character either to the Royal College of Surgeons or to the Incorporated Society of Authors. Such inspiration as comes to the members of these institutions comes to them, whether they are or are not members of the Church, as individual seekers of truth or beauty—not as members of an inspired body. The Church of Christ alone can claim to be inspired as a body by the membership of the Holy Spirit in that Body; and those who spoke rather glibly about Parliament being used by the Holy Ghost to defeat the Prayer Book of 1928 were talking bad theology.

This view of the Church is perhaps the answer to those who challenge its members to define what they mean by the necessity of incorporation in its membership. To claim, as Tertullian

did, that all is in darkness outside the Church is not only to invite ridicule from those who are sufficiently acquainted with the history of theology to know how often the Church has borrowed light from those outside her pale; but it is to deny the power of the Holy Spirit to work through individuals. Mr. Arnold Lunn, who is perhaps the latest exponent of that theory, fails to see how much it invalidates his own ablest arguments. The Church, however, does claim to be, as a whole, the mystical Body of Christ—without which the whole world would end in total darkness.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

PUBLIC SCHOOL RELIGION

Two pamphlets* have been recently published, both in criticism of that ever-present bogey, Public School Religion. Since they seem to me to proceed rather too easily from the particular to the general, I have set down a few points for consideration by those who are interested in the question.

The authors are both of necessity anonymous, but one of the pamphlets ("The Parish Church and the Fifth Form") is sponsored by Dr. Edward Lyttelton. He says, "The record (of the pamphlet) even if it be somewhat overcoloured by the boys' natural desire to get their own back on the parsons, constitutes a direct challenge to our faith."

It betrays no hostile spirit to say that the pamphlets are, from their very nature, self-revealing. The authors of both are obviously of much the same type. They are young and progressive (the type is found in our schools; they are not the only representatives of it) and they are not prepared to take on trust the whole of the Public School tradition. In other matters besides religion they refuse to believe that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds, and that the world of the Public Schools. They are keen church-goers themselves, and have been brought up in the Anglo-Catholic tradition, though "Colin Clout," the author of "Against the Shepherds," is more at home in this than the author of "The Parish Church and the Fifth Form." I should doubt whether they have either of them been to one of the larger boarding-schools as boys. If they have done so, they have both revolted very completely against the institutions which they condemn. But I should strongly suspect that "Colin Clout," at any rate, had been a

* Details at end.

day-boy, and that his religious life had been well formed by regular attendance at some church where appeal had been made to his æsthetic sensibilities. He has just realized, I think, that everyone is not made as he is, and that there are a number of people to whom religion seems to make no personal appeal at all, people who have to be won in spite of themselves; and that there are many, too, in whom the suspicion of anything " high church " is still enormously strong; so strong that those whose business it is to teach religion, in the widest sense, have to be as cunning as serpents.

The criticisms of the first pamphlet (" The Parish Church and the Fifth Form ") are, in the main, four: (*a*) That the Public Schools, being conservative institutions, have failed to move with the times in religious matters; (*b*) that compulsory attendance at Chapel has no connection with religion; (*c*) that the schools are too fond of fantastic experiments in services of the BBC type [this charge would seem, at any rate partially, to cancel out (*a*)]; (*d*) that old boys of these schools do not go to church. Each of these contains some truth, and I should like to deal with each of them in turn.

The substance of the first charge is this. There was a time when the parents of the Public School boys considered it to be their own duty to attend a church service regularly, at any rate once a Sunday. The Public School system of compulsory Sunday Mattins and Evensong dates from this period. No one has bothered to change it. It works fairly well while the boys are at school, even if it is the ruin of religion after that. There is truth in all this. Religious training begins in the home. Where the home has failed, the influence of the school is not going to be great. In all probability, though it is impossible to get exact evidence, the fathers and mothers of our boys attend church at least as well as those of any other walk in life. But that in itself is not enough; they ought to attend church better, and be leaders in this as they are leaders in other activities of the nation. But if the present attitude towards church attendance continues, the parents may well begin to demand the abolition of compulsory Chapel; which might be a good thing.

This brings us to the second charge. But one must sympathize with the attitude of the shepherd who has his lambs safely in the fold. The lambs may skip about a little, as is the habit of lambs, and they may not be learning much about the dangers of the outside world; but they are safe for the moment from the marauding wolf. If you have your boys at a school service, they are learning something. You will not expect them to treat that service quite as adults

treat it. We most of us rebel against authority as we grow up; it is normal in adolescence. If you are wise, you will not give them the same length of service as you give the adult, because you will not expect their attention to be held by any one thing for so long. And you have got them there, in chapel, with a chance of talking to them; if their attitude to you is one of bored indifference, as it sometimes is, it may be your own fault; even though that fault is largely lack of imagination on your part, and a failure to keep your own boyhood in your mind's eye.

Not even the Sixth Former, generally speaking, is old enough to be left to decide for himself whether he ought to attend a chapel service. Too many irrelevant considerations would come in. He would want the time for something else, games or work (probably in that order). It has, in fact, been tried. One great school made its evening service voluntary. For several Sundays everyone came; it was a matter of habit. Then they began gradually to realize the truth of the situation. For a short time no one came. Then a rumour circulated that unless attendances improved, compulsory Chapel would return. So the elder boys ingeniously sent the fags. When this was discovered, compulsory attendance was rightly restored.

Compulsory attendance at early celebrations of the Holy Communion (or, as was more often the case, at the ante-Communion) has, for the most part, disappeared. Although they are going to attend both Mattins and Evensong afterwards, the proportion of confirmed boys who are regular participants at this now voluntary service is generally fairly high. Yet to turn out before breakfast means adding a third service to the two that are already compulsory. This is far more than most of the church-going parents attend, and it is expecting a great deal of a boy.

The fact is, that the compulsory Mattins and Evensong of the Public School has less connection with religion (I hope it has some) than with education. "Colin Clout" is so far right. And every argument against compulsory Chapel can be used against compulsory education. When I read the Æneid with a form, I do not convince them that it is one of the world's great poems. But some of them eventually discover for themselves that it is; and the first laborious process of translation has put them on the right road. Our problem, however, is to make the chapel services the most effective vehicles of religious education; we may grant their frequent ineffectiveness, but not their complete uselessness.

Yet if we try by experiment to shorten or alter services, we are accused of being fantastic experimenters, in league with the

BBC, and out of touch with the realities of Catholic worship. We are on the horns of a dilemma.

It is easy to belabour the BBC. Listening to a service on the wireless is not worshipping God. But there is absolutely no evidence to shew that anyone who wishes to worship God has been tempted away from so doing by a BBC service. One hears it occasionally as an excuse: "No, I don't go to church any longer, but I listen to the broadcast services." It is more of an excuse than a reason. People who say that do not really believe they have found an adequate substitute. On the other hand the sick and the infirm, who genuinely cannot get to church, have found some consolation and some sense of the fellowship which they know and love, in thus listening. Others may well hear an occasional sermon which may stir their hearts, and a sermon may be listened to in an easy chair or in the bar of a public house, as well as in church.

Some of the books of prayers published by the BBC contain extremely fine work. In particular, the latest book of prayers, mainly for the daily service, *New Every Morning*, is very helpful to all who believe in the possibility of the enrichment of common prayer, and do not think it is always necessary to address God in Elizabethan English. The book must, it is scarcely necessary to add, be used with caution. The prayers are intended for use with a congregation who cannot participate, even to the extent of an audible Amen; they will not all be suitable for use with a congregation who must do more than listen.

But some modern attempts at writing collects are certainly very poor. A sense of English style and of the rhythm of English prose would have prevented many of them from being written, and will prevent their use. One particular prayer, containing a phrase about "gallant and high-hearted happiness," comes in for ridicule by both these pamphlets. It is a pretentious-sounding phrase, and means little. The remedy is obvious: do not use the prayer, and be very careful in the choice of modern prayers. But even if we reject 90 per cent. of them there will still be 10 per cent. left which may well stand the test of time and of repetition.

The question of revision of services is a very thorny one. Many of us are convinced that the ideal form of congregational service is the Mass. There is plenty in it for the congregation to do themselves, and you cannot collect the young into one place for any length of time and expect them merely to listen; those who wish to do so have forgotten their own youth. But it is going to be many years before that service rids itself of the prejudice that has grown up against it. It is no use denying that there still exists an enormous prejudice against anything

that can be labelled "high church." The prejudice is violent and unthinking, but it is there; you will not deal with it by saying it does not exist. The Mass has become a party matter, instead of the worship of the whole Church. The boys would attend it perfectly willingly, but numbers of their parents would still raise the cry of "No Popery." So economic reasons forbid the introduction of the choral Eucharist into most schools, for the moment. The Woodard Schools here have the advantage of their foundation; but the other schools have a place to fill in the religious life of the nation, too.

But granted the impossibility for the moment of the choral Eucharist, what services are we to use? Mattins or Evensong (not both) has proved a satisfying form of worship for many generations of adult church people. It does not follow that they are equally suitable for the young. Some abbreviation is certainly justifiable. It can probably come best in the Psalms; and some of the lessons, even in the revised lectionary, are too long. Then there is no reason why we should always pray for the King, the Royal Family, and the Clergy and People; no doubt they always need praying for, especially the clergy, but so do other equally deserving causes, and the powers of attention of the young are limited. It may be a good thing to end the service at the third collect, though this limits the possible variety. I am certain it is wrong to expect the young to attend both Mattins and Evensong, being so similar in structure. It is worth adding that the Litany, the whole of it, with a couple of hymns and a lesson, has been found by experiment to make a very good short congregational service; and provided it is not used too often there is little complaint of tediousness.

But then we, in the schools, want several short services, lasting five to ten minutes, for daily use in the morning or evening. Several are necessary, not one, because variety helps to keep the attention. There is nothing suitable in the Prayer Book; with the possible exception of portions of the Litany, which can certainly be used occasionally. For a late evening service Compline is the obvious choice, though it is something less than tactful to call it Compline. But in spite of criticism, I can see no alternative but that of drawing up for ourselves brief non-liturgical devotions. Many have already done so. The more experiments that are made, the better. Only trial over a considerable period will show which are tolerable and which are not. Mistakes have already been made. I hope they will continue to be made; it is a healthy sign.

The last suggestion in this pamphlet, that in spite of our school religious observances, or perhaps, the author would suppose, because of them, public school men do not go to church.

I wonder if the charge can be made good. In the absence of definite evidence, it is hardly worth discussing. The trouble is, that so many other people do not go to church either. I wonder if the proportion of absentees of the Public School type is any higher than that of any other sort. One will not find a very large number of young men aged eighteen to twenty-five in any church, except at the University towns (a few, it must be remembered, are there, not at home). Then, when they reach the age of marrying and settling down, they often begin to come back. But if someone could really collect evidence on this point, for a large area and spread over several years, and prevent us relying on mere vague impressions, he would be doing a real service.

The second pamphlet under discussion, "Against the Shepherds," goes into greater detail, and so is perhaps more helpful. As I understand him, the author brings forward nine main points, some of which are closely related to each other: that our organization of religion is on the wrong lines, and only succeeds in making religion unattractive to the young; that the religious teaching, especially the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, is quite inadequate; that the parson-schoolmaster is an unnecessary hybrid, and, like most hybrids, sterile (he is called "the real villain of the piece"); that the attitude of the boys to religion is one of bored indifference; that no attempt is made to teach the doctrines of Christianity; that the assistant masters are frequently not Christians themselves, and still less often communicants, although, on the principle that "Paris is worth a Mass" they are ready to assume communicant membership of the Church with their housemasterships; a further hit at the "bogus modernist clerical schoolmaster" comes next; then accusations of amateurishness in our use of non-liturgical prayers and litanies; and lastly, that our sermons are too vague. The author follows this up with seven definite suggestions, all of which are good and some of which are practical.

I should like to write briefly about such of these criticisms as I have not yet dealt with, under three headings: (*a*) the persons concerned—in order of importance, the boys, the assistant masters, and the parsons; (*b*) the teaching of Scripture; (*c*) the teaching of Christian dogma.

I do not believe that the accusation of breeding "bored indifference" in boys is really sound. It certainly is not true among the smaller boys, who will generally talk about religion as freely as they will talk about any other subject. As they grow older, I do not believe they are more bored with religion than with anything else. They are certainly often bored with their school lessons, doing the minimum of work at them, taking

little part in anything that needs intellectual effort, and failing often to respond to any stimulus save that of games. Then, the difficult period past, interest again awakens, and what we may begin to call the soul (for want of a better word) appears. If you see little appreciation of the serious things of life, except in the case of a few rare individuals whose home life has been exceptionally fortunate, before the age of eighteen or so, can you expect such boys to have any feeling for the most serious thing of all, his relationship with his God ? The utmost we can expect to do with the great majority is to form the right habits and see that we do not repel anyone from the observances of religion.

It is rather more difficult to write about the second class, the assistant masters. I only venture to do so, having many personal friends among them, in the firm assurance that few, except the clergy, read THEOLOGY. But here, again, I very much doubt if the level of irreligion is proportionately higher than that found in any other class or profession. Granted that it is far more important that the schoolmasters shall be men to whom religion means something, than the solicitors as a class, or anyone else; nevertheless, the schools can only ultimately exist to provide what parents want, and although they may lead the educational world (as we hope) and lead the parents as well, a leader must not be too far in advance of his flock, or they will fail to understand him and lose him altogether. We would no doubt wish (I mean the authors of these pamphlets, and readers of this article, would wish) that all assistant masters were men of faith and prayer, and intellectually convinced of the truth of Christianity. If they were, the Public Schools would indeed become a power in the land. But we shall not expect a much higher level here than in the other professions. I find it very hard to believe, however, that any assistant master (they are not generally hypocrites) would begin to come to Communion again after having lapsed, because he saw that a housemastership was coming his way. This is a definite accusation in the pamphlet. Such cases must be very rare; far better a non-communicant housemaster.

As for the " real villain of the piece," the parson-schoolmaster, possibly others are better qualified to write than I. Most schools have now appointed chaplains, and do not merely rely on having one or more masters in holy orders; and they recognize, too, that the chaplains as such have a pastoral duty to perform; that they are not merely, as it were, spiritual gramophones to turn on the correct record in Chapel when they are told. Most school chaplains do in fact all, or the greater part of, the Confirmation preparation. Many of them have

themselves been parish priests; although experience of parish life is valuable, I am not personally convinced (after experience) that it is essential. Some of the chaplains do no other school work, on the ground that it spoils their relationship with the boys. Others, among whom I count myself one, would very much miss the personal contacts which come from taking part in the regular timetable of the school, and the sometimes rough-and-ready intimacy of classroom and of games; and this although the labour of doing the double job, especially round Confirmation time, becomes very great. Whether we chaplains as a class really are without "the brains, or even the wish, to tackle Christian theology" or have adopted "a superficial modernism, derived from some three-and-sixpenny textbook"; or spend our Divinity lessons explaining "to boys who do not know the first thing about the creed that St. John's Gospel was probably written by another man of the same name"; or that we are, to sum up, "bogus modernist clerical schoolmasters"—all this I should prefer to leave to others to decide.

On the teaching of Scripture in schools so much has already been written that it seems unnecessary to add to it. Here it need only be said that, in theory, a knowledge of the Bible is a vital necessity to all, and anyone should be able and willing to teach the essentials. In fact, only a small proportion of the masters, not all of them ordained, are willing to devote the necessary time to what has become something of a specialist's study. The utmost care therefore ought to be taken that only those teach Divinity who will do so with conviction, sincerity, and knowledge; but it is a great gain if laymen can take a competent part in this branch of the school's teaching; this avoids the suggestion that the Bible is the parson's province, and of no practical importance to anyone else.

To answer the suggestion that we should give our pupils a good deal more "definite Christian teaching." It is true that many people confuse sloppy thinking with broadmindedness, and think that an undogmatic Christianity (I am not sure what that means) is the best form of Christianity. On the other hand, there is a difference, as I see it, between being dogmatic and laying down the law. Being dogmatic means not being afraid to affirm certain beliefs, which one knows are fundamental; the whole of one's personal religion depends on one's own beliefs; in discussing religion in classroom or pulpit, the personal element must necessarily enter largely. But for my part I am not prepared, except on fundamentals, to say to anyone, man or boy, who has been taught differently, "You ought to believe" this, that, or the other. It is psychologically wrong to set up such a conflict, besides being bound in practice to lead

to trouble. Except in those schools which have been founded with a particular bias towards one form of Christianity, we are dealing with a mixture of Church of England, Catholic and Evangelical, nonconformists of all sorts, and boys from homes which know no religion at all. Frank and open discussion there must be, and the truth will eventually emerge; *magna est veritas, et prævalebit;* but any impression of laying down the law will only defeat its own ends.

" Colin Clout " concludes with seven practical suggestions.

(1) That all teaching of Divinity should be given by practising churchmen. I would only add to that which I have already written, that I should hesitate to take the subject out of the hands of some devout nonconformists who, I know, teach the Scriptures much better than some whose membership of the Church is nominal, or, in the case of Old Testament teaching, out of the hands of at least one Jew, whose religion means more to him than it does to many Christians. I should, for myself, only insist that those who taught it should believe what they taught or give up teaching it.

(2) That preparation for Confirmation shall be given only by those who believe in, and practise, the religion of the Church. After what he has written about school chaplains, I doubt whether it will reassure " Colin Clout " to learn that this is now mostly in the hands of the school chaplains themselves. The time allotted for the preparation is often inadequate, but few can deny that it is conscientiously done.

(3) That Chapel services shall as far as possible be in accordance with the forms of the Book of Common Prayer. With the exceptions referred to above, I should be wholly in agreement with this.

(4) That Holy Communion shall be celebrated at least on all " red letter days," and sufficiently early for boys to be able to receive the Sacrament fasting. This, too, is certainly sound; but I think it is on the way, even if not already in existence. We have been asking for variety in the services, and should use such variety as is provided in the Prayer Book by the proper Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for Saints' days.

(5) That no obstacle shall be placed in the way of boys who wish to make their Confession. Few will quarrel with this. Two points might be observed: first, the very real prejudice which still exists against private Confession, and for which allowance will have to be made for some time yet; secondly, that there is much to be said for not making your Confession to one with whom you are in daily contact, as boys should be with their school chaplain. This is not to admit the truth of the jibe which appears in this section—" It cannot be supposed

that they will usually want to make their Confession to a mere schoolmaster-parson, who has had no experience of the confessional and who is more of a master than a priest." But in dealing with this very difficult subject, so beset by prejudice, the chaplain has not done his duty unless he has shewn the teaching of the Prayer Book about Confession.

(6) That it shall be made possible for boys who are ill to receive Holy Communion. I have no doubt that, if asked, the great majority of us would see that this was done. If we are not often asked, the fault lies with our own teaching and with the boys' home life; and we would like to be asked more often.

(7) That school chapels shall be open all day and thus available for private prayer. This, too, is certainly right and proper; as are also certain suggestions for making it easy to pray in the chapels when open, without intrusion. There is not much privacy in boarding-school life, and if it is difficult enough to pray when conditions are easy, it is still more difficult in a crowded and noisy dormitory. But I should myself prefer to tackle the matter from the other end, and go on teaching ways of prayer, and trying to arouse a sense of the need of prayer. If this is done, the boys will begin to want somewhere to pray.

I think that both these pamphlets, although they contain much that is crude, unfair, and ill-informed, will do good. Honest criticism hurts no man, and the sincerity of these critics is obvious in every line. I do not even want to plead that the school chaplains are doing their best at a very difficult job, and therefore ought to be exempt from criticism. But I would also, in conclusion, put forward a suggestion to the authors and to other critics who think that the parish is the only sphere of operations really worthy of a priest. There are many signs that the parochial system no longer has the hold on the country which it had in past days. In towns, owing to the ease of transport, the unit has become the congregation rather than the parish; and although responsibility for a definite number of roads and houses still has great value, no one can pretend that all the members of a congregation any longer come from the parish so defined. In the country, the depletion of the countryside and the impoverishment of the big landowners make it still more difficult to keep the system going. It may very well be that the future of the pastoral work of the Church of England lies rather with an extension of the non-parochial ministry, through chaplaincies, besides those to schools, to institutions of all sorts, and through the work of organizations like the Industrial Christian Fellowship and Toc H; indeed, as the latter is so fond of saying, the Apostolic command

amounts to an order to gather in the converts by hook or by crook. While there is still much for the shepherd with his crook to do, those who can use the hook, and even bait it if occasion offers, may be doing just as useful work.

"The Parish Church and the Fifth Form." By a Public School Master; with a preface by Edward Lyttelton, D.D. London, S.P.C.K., 1937. 4d.

"Against the Shepherds." An Indictment of Public School Religion. By Colin Clout. London, The Church Literature Association. 4d.

W. H. OLDAKER.

MISCELLANEA

SOME NOVELISTS ON REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE

We have been accustomed to repeat the saying that man is a creature of large discourse looking before and after. But generalizations are proverbially insecure, and farsightedness is not characteristic of the ordinary man. The capacity to realize what mercifully we have never experienced is, with the generality of men, extremely limited. The authors of romance are students of human nature, and when they are on the side of the Angels they render great service to their race. The keenness of their insight, and the vividness of their imagination, enables them to present to unimaginative people the results which follow on the deeds which they describe. They are able to represent with tremendous and convincing power the social consequences which naturally ensue when people are divorced and marry again while their former partner lives.

The great French novelist Bourget was in his earlier period a captive to Materialism, and positively immersed in the psychology of the passions. From that captivity he escaped and became a convert to the Catholic Religion. In his later period he wrote that powerful novel *A Divorce*, which traces relentlessly the ultimate results in certain cases of divorce and remarriage.

Bourget distinguishes marriage into the obvious three classes: the lawless, the legal and the religious.

1. As for the *lawless* marriage, its advocate insists "that a man or a woman, to be engaged to one another and to set up a home, have no need of a priest to give his blessing, or of a magistrate to register their engagement."

Bourget considers the sequel to that course. Experience proves its liability to reaction, especially on the part of the woman. "She may have professed scorn for social conventions, that of marriage in particular, may have claimed the right to enter into free union and put her theories into practice under circumstances which almost excuse her. All this she may have done. But once let honest and sincere love awake in her, and instinctively she is possessed by unreasoned and invincible shame at the thought of her previous capitulation without the sanction of *religion* or *law*."

2. There is the *legal* marriage, in the registrar's office, with its independence of any definite religion. What, to be precise, is its exact significance? "Legal marriage adds nothing to the real marriage except that it adds guarantees. As society is now constituted, when a man legally marries a woman it is a public declaration that he has faith in her, and that he allows no one to doubt her."

3. Then there is *religious* marriage. Wherein lies the distinction from the legal? It is in the fact that the religious marriage calls in a third element, above the man and the woman, and that third element is God.

Thus the religious marriage includes all that is best in the legal, and transcends it. For the legal marriage is simply concerned with the human. At the same time, the novelist insists that the religious

marriage, to be sincere, requires belief in the religion. He complains that every day men who are unbelievers agree to marry under the forms of Christian religion the girl whom they love, and who would not consent to be their wife without the solemn ceremony. But this compromise with conscience, says the novelist, is bad for any human being. It is demoralizing to make solemn professions in the sight of God and their fellow-creatures without deliberately weighing what it is to which those professions commit you.

A masterly analysis follows of the case of divorce and re-marriage where the man is a sceptic, and the woman, originally a believer, driven from her faith by the scepticism of the man, ultimately returns to the religion she had forsaken. Painful and heart-rending conflict ensues. Can two walk together except they be agreed ?

The appeal to sympathy with individual misery leaves this novelist entirely unconvinced. " Here is a case in which justice and charity demand the sacrifice of the individual interest for the general good. This principle dominates all society. If we are called upon to decide between two courses, the first clearly beneficial to the whole community but painful to some individual, the second agreeable to him but hurtful to the whole, both justice and charity demand that we shall adopt the first course."

Another novelist — Marion Crawford—represents, in *Katherine Lauderdale*, the different spirit in which marriage in Church is approached. He pictures how it appeared to the man, and then to the woman: " To the man it was an inevitable formality, to be gone through with scrupulous exactness indeed, and to be carefully recorded and witnessed, but there was not a particle of romance connected with it, any more than with the signing and witnessing of a title deed or any other legal document.

" Katherine had a somewhat different opinion of it, for it had a real religious value in her eyes. In any case it would be a solemn moment. The obligations, as she viewed them, were for life. The very words of the promise had an imposing simplicity. In the Church to which she strongly inclined, marriage was called a Sacrament, and believed to be one, in which the presence of the Divine personally sanctified the bond of the human. Katherine was quite willing to believe that too.

" That holy hour, when it came at last, should be holy indeed. There should be nothing, ever hereafter, to disturb the pure memory of its sanctity. A quiet church, the man she loved, herself, and the interpreter of God. That was all she wanted—not to be disturbed in the greatest event of her life by all the rustling, glittering, flower-scented, grinning, gossiping crowd of critics, whose ridiculous presence is considered to lend marriage a dignity beyond what God or nature could bestow upon it."

A different picture of the divorced seeking happiness elsewhere is drawn by Marion Crawford in *Adam Johnstone's Son*. The man went off with another woman: the woman with another man. Some twenty-seven years elapse, and they meet again in a foreign hotel. They are seated at the same table in the restaurant. When the dinner was ended the old man sought an interview with his former wife. Not because it was in his power to change the past, but because he wanted to be forgiven.

" ' It is a strange situation,' she said, ' as we were today at table. You with your wife beside you, and your divorced wife opposite you, and only you and I knowing it.'

"'I was alone. What was I to do? I was poor and lonely, and a divorced woman, though the right had been on my side. Another man intervened. He knew all about it, and I married him. I did not love you any more, then, but I told him the truth when I told him that I could never love anyone again. He was satisfied—so we were married.'"

Then the man speaks. "'I want you to say that you forgive me,' he said. . . . There was something pathetic in the appeal. She said nothing. It meant almost too much for her, even after twenty-seven years. This old man had taken her, an innocent young girl, had married her, had betrayed her while she dearly loved him, and had blasted her life at the beginning. Even now it was hard to forgive.

"'You can't,' said the old man suddenly. 'I see it. It's too much to ask, I suppose, and I've never done anything to deserve it.' The pale face grew paler, but the hands were still, and grasped each other, firm and cold. The lips moved, but no sound came. Then a moment, and they moved again. 'You're mistaken,' she said, 'I do forgive you.' He caught her two hands in his, and his face shone. 'God bless you,' he tried to say."

The force of this picture consists in its recognition that a man and a woman possess a memory and a conscience; and that in the passage of the years the past is not effaced but haunts the present. It illustrates the Scripture scene: "O thou man of God, art thou come unto me to call my sin to remembrance?" According to the novelist it was human forgiveness that was sought. Of Divine forgiveness not a word is said.

The far-off consequences of divorce and re-marriage upon the man and his wife fill the pages of Romance. But there is another side less frequently treated, but which nevertheless ought strongly to appeal to men and women, and that is the consequences to the child.

Some instructive scenes on this aspect of divorce are pictured by E. M. Delafield under the suggestive title *Nothing is Safe*. "The fact was that Mummie and Daddy, after appearing to be just like other parents all their lives—well, all their lives ever since Julia (their daughter) had known them—had decided that they did not really love one another a bit, and did not want to live together any more. . . ."

"Then—or later—Julia realized that it was quite a long time since she'd even seen Daddy. So he'd actually gone, already. It was rather startling, in a way. One hadn't realized that anything was happening."

"A more disturbing problem awaited her in the near future. Mummie in a letter . . . announced that she had married somebody else. Daddy wasn't her husband any more, Captain Blank, whom they knew already, was."

"It made one feel such a fool to have two fathers and two mothers."

"Mummie, unmarried to Daddy and married instead to somebody else, might, she was afraid, seem somehow like a different person."

And the whole interest of the book is centred upon the boy and the girl and the pathetic consequence to them of their parents' divorce and re-marriage—not wanted at all by one of the new partners in either establishment—superfluous at best, and sometimes very much in the way—embarrassing.

Then the nervous effect of it all upon a young and excitable child. And the consultation with a specialist in psychology to find a cure, provoking from a wise woman the criticism: "What do these psychologists know that any sensible mother couldn't have told them years ago? It doesn't take a psychologist to find out that what every child needs

is to be taught the true meaning of religion and discipline, in a happy, settled home."

The woman's point of view is put in the *Far Horizon*, by Lucas Malet. It is summed up in the following outspoken sentences.

"Not that I cared for a divorce. I consider it the clumiest invention out for setting wrongs right. I have too great a respect for marriage, which ought, if it means anything, to mean motherhood and children, and a clean wholesome start in life for the second generation. When a woman breaks away and crosses the lines, she only makes bad worse, in my opinion, by the hypocritical respectability of a marriage while her husband is still alive. Let's be honest sinners anyway, if sin we must."

By way of contrast, and as an inspiring reminder of the beautiful affection which human nature at its best can display, let us turn not to fiction this time, but to fact, nor to the long ago, but to the very age in which we live. An infant child was born and died on the same day. Here is a letter that the mother received. "I cannot tell you what I feel about this great sorrow that has come to you, and to all of us after your happy preparations, how cruel it seems. We will be doubly loving and unselfish to you, and yet I know nothing can make up for this blow. I know how much this meant to you. I am longing to see you and comfort you in this sorrow. . . . You know I have never been able to bear to think of your being miserable, so do not be too unhappy for my sake, and get strong again. . . . This is just a love-line to tell you how much I am thinking of you. If only I could see you myself. I think of you night and day."

What relation would you suppose between the writer of that letter of consolation and its receiver? It was her son. And he was only nineteen years of age. Is there not something very wonderful in its depth of love and maturity of thoughtfulness? He was a son who wrote from the trenches on the night before the battle in which he died. "I will never do anything to make you unhappy because I love you more than any son has ever loved his mother, and with better reason." On which letter a reader of those lines remarked: "it is surely one of the most beautiful and manly expressions of fortitude and filial devotion in the language. He was indeed a memorable son. But no less memorable was his mother, for it was, on his own shewing, her wonderful devotion which appealed to the best that was in him. No son could have written as he did unless the mother had been of such high character as to win such chivalrous admiration and reverence.

It is a relief to close on such a note as this, a witness to the height to which human affection can ascend. It does us good to linger at times on the nobler realities of life; on such words as the beautiful haunting sentences of the sacred Book:

> "Entreat me not to leave thee,
> Or to return from following after thee,
> For whither thou goest I will go,
> And where thou lodgest I will lodge,
> Thy people shall be my people,
> And thy God my God."
>
> "The Lord do so to me and more also
> If aught but death part thee and me."

Could any utterance be more appropriate to the ideal relation between a man and his wife?

W. J. S. S.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

May not St. Paul's knowledge of the Virgin Birth be implied and taught by the phrase he uses of God as "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; cf. also 1 Pet. i. 3) and may it not be that St. Paul and St. Peter meant by this phrase to emphasize the fact that the only father our Lord had was God? St. Luke's Gospel, which I cannot but suppose St. Paul knew, says that "that holy thing which was to be born of Mary was Son of God because He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and by the power of the Highest" (Luke i. 35), and I think this may be what St. Paul has in his mind by the use of the phrase. With Luke i. 35 it is interesting to compare also our Lord's words in John x. 36—"Him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world."

G. E. Boyle.

I suppose the conclusion of the Rev. J. W. Parker's article on the Virgin Birth is "Not proven, but more probable than not." In his efforts to be fair to the impugners of that doctrine some of us will think that he gives away more than is either necessary or safe. For example, that which was drawn from the substance of our Lord's Mother was of course entirely human, not divine. But why incompletely human? This supposition leads us straight to Apollinarianism with its substitution of the Logos for the human rational soul in our Lord. Traditional Christianity represents our Lord as man plus something more than man, never as deficient in anything human, unless sin be an essential element of human nature. If so, then indeed "our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins." This consideration leads to another point: that which drove mediæval thinkers to formulate the doctrine of "the Immaculate Conception." Mr. Parker rightly observes that mother no less than father hands on the entail of sin. Yes, but that which is drawn from either father or mother could be cleansed by Divine Spirit before ever it had reached the stage of personality. It is true that Heb. iv. 15 as usually understood presents a difficulty; but not if we adopt the interpretation of *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας* favoured by Bishop Westcott: "Christ assumed humanity under the conditions of life belonging to man fallen, though not with sinful promptings from within." This finds support from Heb. ii. 18, where the emphasis is laid on the suffering our Lord experienced through temptation, not on the victory He won. He who is tempted can rely on the sympathy of the Incarnate, and thence derive assurance of help. Temptation is suggestion to natural human instincts to gain satisfaction in perverse ways. The stronger the instinct, and the more sensitive to inhibition, the greater and more immediate the delusive promise of satisfaction held out in the temptation; the keener will be the suffering experienced in resistance. Our Lord experienced suffering of this kind not merely as keenly as, but more keenly than, we can.

C. E. Scott-Moncrieff.

THE DOCTRINAL COMMISSION AND THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE

While it is no doubt valuable to discover that a saner view of this sacrament is being taken by those members of the Commission who

cannot be described as Catholic, yet it is difficult indeed to understand what meaning can possibly be attached to the statement: "It is important to recognize that it is a ministry of the word open to all but obligatory on none." I venture to suggest that these words come from that charity which, as the Orthodox delegation at Edinburgh pointed out, should not be appealed to when questions of truth are under consideration. In fact, the phrase "obligatory on none" is meaningless as it stands.

It seems to me that there are two kinds of obligation to which these words may be related: (1) a legal obligation; or (2) a moral obligation. Under (1) comes a further question: (*a*) At what point does the consensus of opinion—*e.g.*, a "precept" of the Church—impose a legal obligation on its members? (*b*) How far is the Canon Law interpreting the Easter Precept unreformed, unrepealed, and therefore binding on members of the Church of England today?

I am sure it would be worse than useless to insist on a legal obligation to come to sacramental confession. Every priest who has sufficient experience as a confessor knows quite well that the person who comes to his Easter duties simply because he feels he has to, is one of the most difficult of all persons to deal with. Nor does our Book of Common Prayer profess to be a legal instruction. The compilers of the Prayer Book merely took over the general ideas of their day, and in this case are issuing general pastoral instructions which would be understood and interpreted by the original users of the Prayer Book along lines common to all. For example, the phrase "commonly called Sacraments" is on a par with the fact that the Feast of the Nativity of our Lord is "commonly called Christmas Day."

But there is more to be said. If a person cannot quieten his conscience without sacramental confession, then the Longer Exhortation seems quite definitely to place him under an obligation to make his confession to his priest. A moral obligation is laid upon him, no matter what the Doctrinal Commission may say about it.

With regard to the Longer Exhortation. It seems to me that it is too often regarded as a theological statement rather than a pastoral charge. Over and over again one reads the words of people who write about this Exhortation as if it were a general statement of the Church of England on confession. But surely it is not this. It is an *ad hoc* pastoral monition, designed to be used at certain stated times—*i.e.*, "when the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion." It refers, not to the general practice of Communion and of confession as a preparation thereto, but simply and solely to the *next* Communion—it may be on the following Sunday. So the Exhortation does not define a life-long attitude towards confession, but gives advice as to the preparation involved during the next few days. The question whether a man may or may not go to confession for his entire lifetime is not, it seems to me, touched on here at all. There is no hint that a man is encouraged to make a temperamental and subjective decision about going to confession in a general way, but that at the present moment and in preparation for his next Communion, he is asked to consider whether there is any definite sin on his conscience.

The Exhortation may perhaps be summarized as follows: "Next Sunday I propose to celebrate the Holy Communion, when you should be present and make your Communion. This most holy Sacrament is

of such a high potentiality for good or for evil that due preparation is necessary. So you must prepare yourself by examination and private confession of your sins. But if there is (since your last confession) something on your conscience (*e.g.*, some mortal sin which, as you have been previously taught, can be dealt with only in a sacramental manner) come and make your confession to me or to some other priest."

Thus the Exhortation contemplates that some will prepare themselves for their *next* Communion without having to resort to sacramental confession; but it does not suggest that those persons will necessarily *always* prepare in this way, or that they will be the same persons each time the Exhortation is read. And this may be said fairly to represent the state of affairs in any Anglo-Catholic parish today.

Similarly with the rubric in the Visitation of the Sick. "Here shall a sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter." The Office does not contemplate the moving or urging of a sick man—perhaps on his death-bed or in great pain—to go over his whole life and prepare for a first confession, though unhappily that may have been done. Rather, the sick person is invited to make a *special* confession of anything on his mind since his last confession. He is merely urged to do, at this solemn moment, something that he is quite used to doing in his ordinary life.

To read into these two specific Prayer Book instances a general statement of a special Church of England attitude towards confession seems to me to be putting the cart before the horse. After all, the compilers of our Prayer Book (even more so the compilers of the 1549 book) had heard of confession! One might as well say that the Church of England teaches confession only for the sick, or even for sick *men* as opposed to sick *women*, according to the rubric!

It seems that the opposite process should be our guide here. Just as the compilers of the 1549 Prayer Book assumed that priests knew where to stand and what to do at the Altar, and therefore did not insert specific rubrical directions to this effect all through the service; so confession is assumed to be the normal practice of the people, and in both the instances I have been considering the priest is bidden to call the attention of his people to this practice. The compilers of the Prayer Book did not discover a new way of dealing with sins, they merely carried on a custom which they found in their day. And the fact that they did not issue explicit instructions for a complete change tells heavily in favour of the traditional use of the Sacrament of Penance. All that can be said, therefore, on the question of obligation, is that the compilers of our Prayer Book point out that the ultimate decision for the making of any one confession at a given time rests with the individual himself. His conscience—presumably enlightened by Christian teaching and by the previous advice of his parish priest—will at times lay a moral obligation on him whereby he will know when the time has come for him to make his next confession and seek "the benefit of absolution."

R. H. Le Messurier.

ECCE HOMO

An eyewitness recalls the scene. Without Pilate's palace the crowd is restless with cruelty and hate. Pilate steps out into sudden stillness and

speaks: "I am bringing Him out before you that you may know I find no crime in Him." Again a moment of silent anticipation: Jesus comes forward, dreadfully changed, with the dull red cloak hardly concealing the wounds, and the cruel and ridiculous crown. In the persisting hush, Pilate speaks again, "Behold the man. . . ."

I would suggest that, to one eyewitness, those words sounded like the beginning of a quotation, a chance but so much the more startling reference to a passage of Scripture that immediately presented itself to his mind. The passage was this: "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, Behold the man whose name is the Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne" (Zech. vi. 12).

The *Ecce Homo* of Pilate fell upon that eyewitness's ears as an unwitting confession of the character of his prisoner and so indicated to those with ears to hear the crowned King and Priest, the builder of the true temple of God.

F. A. Heaton.

SILENCE AND SACRED SONG

OR

"THE TOUCH OF AN ANGEL'S WING"

I sat secluded in a dark recess,
  And saw two rows of choir-boys all in white,
  Standing and waiting in a pool of light,
Wrapt in unwonted silence. Who could guess
The cause of such unusual calm, unless
  Their guardian angels, mustering out of sight,
  Had softly touched them with their pinions bright,
And hushed to peace their natural restlessness?

Ye choirs, who fill the courts of heaven with praise,
  Yet listen intently to the Eternal Word,
Help us, ashamed of our unheavenly ways,
  To hold our peace and still to praise the Lord:
Marvelling how meetly each to each belong—
Your watchful silence and your glorious song.

F. M. D.

CORRESPONDENCE

SACRIFICE

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Is Mr. Proctor correct in saying "Christ offered Himself once on the historical Calvary"? If the Bishop of Lincoln and others are right, Calvary was not an altar (in spite of our mediæval hymns!): our Lord was *slain* once for all on Calvary, but His offering was not on Calvary but in Heaven, and eternal: "Thou art a Priest *for ever*." Mr. Proctor presses Fr. Bévenot's metaphor from wireless to an extent

which its author probably did not intend. The Mass is "an effective sacrifice," in the sense in which prayer is effective, by bringing us into the one perpetual offering in Heaven: no one can "repeat Calvary," or "offer Christ anew," but in the Eucharist we take our part, with all the company of Heaven, in the one perpetual offering which never ceases.

The question remains, however, whether this view of the Eucharist as sacrifice is compatible with the decrees of Trent. It does not matter what the Reformers or their opponents thought on this subject, because (if the Bishop of Lincoln is right) none of them understood what sacrifice really is. But Trent has perpetuated, for those who regard it as infallible, the limitations of the sixteenth century; it is Trent that makes the barrier between Roman and non-Roman Christendom impassable; no compromise, still less capitulation, is possible here; the Creed of Pius IV. is incompatible with the Anglican priest's ordination vow, and with the patristic principle on which it is based. It is surprising that Fr. Congar should imagine (*Chrétiens desuniés*, p. 37) that Trent is not contrary to Anglican principles.

May I add a note on an entirely different subject? Miss Hort says (p. 305) "Russians are Slavs, not Aryans." Both are linguistic terms, and every Slav is necessarily an Aryan. One might as well say "The Spaniards are Latins, not Aryans," or "The Welsh are Kelts, not Aryans"!

Your obedient servant,

C. B. Moss.

THE ORAL TRADITION

A REMARK made by Canon Crum in your May issue brings into sharp definition an assumption which is doing great harm. In discussing Dom Chapman's desperate suggestion that shorthand reporters were present at the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount, he says—"They were such Sayings as dwelt in the heart of many hearers. They were Sayings which could not be listened to by the score: Sayings that could not be received in one 'discourse,' all strung together. They were too great for that. They floated in loving memories."

With one half of this statement one must agree. They were not sayings which could be listened to by the score. They were not sayings that could be received in one "discourse," all strung together. In short, they were not *obiter dicta*, they were the deliberate pronouncements of a Rabbi to his pupils, carefully framed, and meant to be exactly retained. If one may allow himself to frame conjectures, the occasion was either a withdrawal into privacy for the purposes of teaching, in which case the summings-up would be repeated and repeated, so as to fasten their precise and deliberate phraseology in the minds of the pupils, or—what is so familiar to every teacher—a repetitive lesson, in which the leading phrases of a course of instruction are etched into the pupils' minds. I am reminded, as I think of it, of the teacher, who taught me teaching, who said "You must clinch your nails."

Contrary though the idea may be to our vague sentimentality, Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, is teaching as a Lawgiver. Now a lawgiver gives a precise dictum, for each of his cases, and is careful that its exact form be observed by his hearers.

Considering this, I must disagree with the suggestion that these sayings "floated in their memories." The words may well stand, but they involve a misleading set of suppositions, based on the assumption that our peculiar mentality has been characteristic of all time. Nowadays, the very existence of a capacity for remembering accurately and extensively is a matter of chance. But the training of memory was the outstanding feature of education in that country at that time. The pupils of Jesus were persons whose first, and therefore fundamental, idea of knowledge was the retention of the exact phraseology of a lesson. The beginning of education, which always determines the set of a man's mind, was learning by rote. Their memories, therefore, did not operate casually, like ours. What was in them was not chance flotsam, but something grasped and held by a trained faculty.

Moreover, to appreciate the then conditions, it is necessary to realize that the English shyness in talking about religion is abnormal. Anyone who has lived in Scotland, for example, can realize how eagerly and incessantly these verdicts of Jesus on faith and conduct would be canvassed, and realize, too, how great would be the anxiety to retain, or ascertain, the exact form of words uttered by the authority. Therefore, instead of lying in a secret privacy where they might suffer insensible changes, these reports must have been checked, incessantly, by persons who were, be it repeated, trained to exactitude of memory.

No thinking person will deprecate the attention which has been paid to the question of what took place when men began to write down Gospel information, or the importance of the conclusions arrived at. The man in the pew is comforted by all this. But he feels very uneasy about the interval of thirty years or so which is supposed to have elapsed between; and he is not being helped by the few and casual references to Oral Tradition which are made, since these are not, as a rule, calculated to make him understand how different a part memory played in the culture of those times.

R. O. P. Taylor.

REVIEWS

SAINT JOHN OF THE CROSS. By Bede Frost. Hodder and Stoughton. 18s.

We are grateful to Father Bede Frost for having written this valuable book. Its publication has been aptly timed; and this apparently by Providence, for Father Frost had begun his work before Professor Peers published his translation (the first from a correct text) of the whole of Saint John's writings. The writings of the saint are such as to call for some sort of expository primer, providing an account not so much of his life, character and times (though this is helpful and is here interestingly given), as of his theological background, his purpose in writing and the type of readers for whom he wrote. That students of the " doctor of divine love " who fail to get a grasp of such matters can go grievously astray as to their meaning is made clear enough by two recent works of importance, Paul Elmer More's *Christian Mysticism* and Mr. Aldous Huxley's *Means and Ends* (Chapter XIV, " Beliefs."). The former in a distinguished essay, reprinted by S.P.C.K. in 1932, delivered a deeply sincere and beautifully phrased attack against Saint John of the Cross as a neoplatonist wolf that has insinuated his way into the catholic fold to the ruin of the flock. (Would that Father Bede Frost could write as clearly and movingly as did that great Christian, whose views may have been those of Esau, but his hands and his temper were those of Jacob !) Mr. More, with the commendation of an Anglican religious in THEOLOGY, held that however orthodox Saint John's intentions, his loyalty to the Incarnation and Sacraments was in despite of, rather than because of, his mystical doctrine and programme. Mr. Huxley on the contrary finds that it is Saint John's very readiness to assert the necessity of devotion to the personal Saviour which leads to the " dark nights " of desolation. These are caused, Mr. Huxley maintains, by the needless anguish of losing contact with a personal manifestation of the divine: a spirituality which starts with an impersonal spiritual principle as its end knows nothing, he maintains, of such trials. The perusal of Father Frost's book will shew those who hold these or similar misconceptions that Saint John of the Cross stands firm on the solid ground of the great Christian tradition; occupying indeed a middle station between the Platonized sacramentalism of More and the neo-Platonist absolutism of Mr. Huxley. Father Frost makes clear that the

counsels of Saint John of the Cross are not, and are not intended to be, applicable to the average Christian, but to those, whether living in or out of the "world," who are being called to contemplative prayer: yet he insists rightly that the Saint has valuable and necessary things to say to all Christians, and that there are none in these days of insipid and complacent religiosity but would benefit by catching something of his realism of soul.

One overhears oneself congratulating Saint John of the Cross on his influence upon this his latest champion. Whereas Father Frost continues to display the same wide knowledge of all kinds of spirituality except that of the Anglican communion, his tone is becoming less provocatively post-Tridentine, less acidulated and in the true Caroline sense more "moderate." (*V.* P. E. More's introductory essay in "Anglicanism." Surely in this sense Saint John of the Cross was a great doctor of "moderation.") It is true that the author's peculiarity of orientation sometimes still betrays itself, as when on p. 266 he seems to reprove the Authorized Version for failing to follow the Vulgate in a mistranslation, or on p. 310 lets fall the revealing phrase "the incomparable incomprehensiveness (*sic*) of God." But on the whole he speaks here with disarming modesty in an accent more homely and therefore more catholic than in earlier books, and speaks therefore more tellingly to our condition. Certain faults of the author's style remain distressing. His method of punctuation is quite his own and sometimes causes obscurity and even failure in grammar. He has a tiresome habit of hanging a great name on the tail of the simplest truth—*e.g.*, "as Saint Augustine says," "as Saint Thomas Aquinas says." It does not increase our desire to study the Fathers to find that they have made so many observations which have occurred to ourselves. Saint Teresa threatened a theologian, who had developed this habit, that she would "delate him to the Inquisition."

The gravamen of the common charge against Saint John of the Cross is that he indulged his faculty for mystical experience to the extent of unconsciously substituting a neoplatonist metaphysic for true Christian theism. This charge is based upon a failure to distinguish between the discipline of intellectual renunciation in the exercise of contemplative prayer and the dialectical use of the *via negativa* after the neoplatonist fashion in the sphere of metaphysics. The author of the pseudo-Dionysian treatises describes both operations and distinguishes between them: but the majority of later writers who came under his influence slurred over this difference, as modern critics of the mystics continue to do, to the perilous darkening of counsel. (See on this Dom John Chapman on "Roman

Catholic Mysticism" in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*) The spiritual doctrine of Saint John of the Cross is "not metaphysical but evangelical: it is the pure corollary and unfolding of the good tidings of our redemption; the stripping which he preaches and the emptying of the mind are just fundamental applications of the law of the Cross and of conformity with Christ according to the law of the Beatitudes" as these apply to certain types of soul and at certain stages of spiritual development. M. Maritain, whom we have been quoting, has also said that "to obtain a real understanding of the element of speculative knowledge in his writings, one should relate their essential principles to the teaching of Saint Thomas Aquinas, as to their natural system of reference." It is a great part of the value of Father Frost's book that he does so relate their principles to the teaching of the New Testament and to that of Saint Thomas. A second great merit is that he proves an admirable guide in his account of the relation between the right of sense and that of the spirit, and with regard to the kind of prayer appropriate to these. He gives a sensible evaluation of the overpressed distinction between acquired and infused contemplation, and of the three grades—purgative, illuminative, unitive—of the mystical way.

There is, it seems to me, a more discriminating criticism of this mystic that receives no mention in the book. The growth of Christian wisdom has surely necessitated a correction, at least in view of modern conditions, in the teaching of such a mystic with regard to detachment. (Their *practice*—and that of Saint John of the Cross in particular—seems often to have been just what is required.) Von Hügel has shewn once and for all how the soul's purification can be gained not merely by turning away from the particular, by abstraction and absorption more and more in the divine simplicity, but also by using "occupation with the concrete" (*e.g.*, experimental science, critical scholarship, the work of teaching or of organization) as a "purifying medium which as many will and ought to use" nowadays "as have in the past striven to use the medium of abstraction alone." Perhaps Father Frost, if a second edition is called for, may feel drawn to add an appendix in which he sets forth the magnificent contribution made by "the Baron" to the present day utilization of the mystics, the seeds of which are contained in a letter to Father Tyrrell of September 26, 1898.

GEOFFREY CURTIS, C.R.

Sacrifices in Ancient Israel. Their Origin, Purposes and Development. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

The substance of this book was given in lectures to the theological students at King's College, London. It consists of a careful criticism of the meaning and value of sacrifice in the religion of Israel. The theory, popular fifty years ago, that the prophets discouraged sacrifice is shewn to be an exaggeration. Yet the Psalmists are represented as tending to what the writer regards as a more spiritual expression of religion.

All this paves the way for a criticism on the traditional doctrine of the Atonement on the cross. The doctrine that our Lord's death was the sacrifice whereby sins are forgiven is rejected.

Our Lord's saying that He came to "give His life a ransom for many" is explained to mean that He was setting His disciples an example which it was their duty to follow. "But how could they possibly offer their lives as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world?" This criticism is not convincing, since it cannot be assumed that our Lord would not think Himself able to serve mankind in a higher way than His disciples could do. A modern Jewish comment on the passage is: "It is true that to give your life for others is the highest possible service, but the word 'ransom' seems to imply something more . . . God somehow makes the death of Jesus help in the salvation of others." So writes Mr. Claude Montefiore, adding the further reflection that "Jewish Christians would eventually understand it as meaning that the death of the Messiah was the means of redemption for Israel."

The term 'ransom' had in Jewish use sacrificial associations, as in the prayer of Eleazar: "Make my blood an expiatory offering for them, and take my life as their ransom" (2 Macc. vi. 23). Moreover, it is certain that St. Paul applied the term 'ransom' to our Lord in a sacrificial sense. "There is one . . . Mediator also between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. ii. 6). St. Paul then clearly regarded our Lord as a ransom for all in a sense higher than that of which His disciples were capable. Are we to say that St. Paul was unduly influenced by Jewish sacrificial presuppositions?

Coming to the institution of the Eucharist, the writer notes that St. Matthew alone of the Synoptic Gospels mentions forgiveness of sins by the shedding of blood, and suggests what of course it is quite impossible to prove, that this idea is due not to anything that Christ said or intended, but to the

influence of the traditional Jewish ideas of sacrifice over the Evangelist's mind.

After this critical removal of any traces of sacrifice from the two chief passages where Christendom has found it, the writer complains of the absence of the doctrine from Christ's teaching. If the Cross is the means of obtaining forgiveness, "if this central feature of the Christian religion really was of such paramount importance, in effect, the salvation of the human race, would it not have found definite emphatic and reiterated utterance in the teaching of our Lord"?

But this criticism surely rests on a grave misapprehension of our Lord's mission. For this criticism implies not only that Christ came to this world expressly to preach the Gospel, but that this was the chief purpose of His coming. Whereas as Dale of Birmingham said years ago, "the real truth is that while He came to preach the Gospel, His chief object in coming was that there might be a Gospel to preach." "There is nothing revolting, nothing even startling," said Dale, "in supposing that the life of Christ may contain revelations of truth, and revelations of infinite value, to which He Himself never gave a definite form in language." Nothing can be more true to the circumstances than our Lord's own words: "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

Dr. Oesterley himself quotes Rashdall's incisive reminder that many things may be true about Christ which Christ Himself never taught. These may become so absorbed into the teaching of the Christian Church as to be a permanent and indispensable part of Christianity. But Dr. Oesterley contends that the principle of development cannot be applied to the traditional doctrine of the Atonement. Why not? First, because that doctrine cannot, he thinks, be deduced from Christ's teaching. But the Apostolic interpreters were convinced that it can. Secondly, because that doctrine of Atonement by Godward sacrifice involves a conception about God which the writer is unable to accept.

Now in the writer's opinion the traditional doctrine of the Atonement is "that Christ suffered the punishment due to mankind." Also that "God has been offended by the sins of men, and before He can forgive He must be bought off, and this is done by the Sacrifice of the Cross." The writer admits that this "is putting it rather baldly." Indeed it is. Also that "the Father imposed and the Son endured a punishment for offences which He had never committed."

Before the traditional doctrine can be dismissed, it must be represented in terms which its adherents would accept. What

is the traditional doctrine? It is essentially that the Atonement was Godward. It is an act of reparation for the sin of man: "an offering and a sacrifice to God." It originates in the Divine compassion. It consists in the Sinless self-identified with the sinful, and making the perfect reparation to the Eternal Holiness. That is substantially what the traditional faith of Christendom, whether Catholic or Protestant, has represented.

The conclusion, however, of the essay is that the Atonement simply consists in our Lord's example and appeal to men. The doctrine of a Godward reparation to the Father is regarded as an Apostolic mistake due to the influence of Jewish ideas of sacrifice. They were "unduly influenced by Old Testament conceptions." The writer allows that "it must be recognized that this explanation runs counter to the more or less official teaching of the Church, Catholic and Protestant, from apostolic times onward until the present day." He owns that this "is a very serious thing." But he insists on returning back to Christ, and ignoring both the Apostolic interpretation and the more or less official teaching of Christendom down the whole course of its existence.

A conclusion which is acknowledged to be irreconcilable both with Apostolic teaching and with the belief of the Christian world is surely thereby confessed to stand in need of most serious and prolonged reconsideration, if the Christian Religion is not to be entirely undermined. If it were the fact that Christendom, both Catholic and Protestant alike, had entirely misrepresented the cause for which the Father sent His Son, what becomes of the Divine guidance of the Church through the abiding presence of the Spirit of the Living God?

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

Jesus and His Sacrifice. A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels. By Vincent Taylor, D.D. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

There are still so few first-rate modern books on the interpretation of the Gospels that each addition to their number is matter for congratulation. The core of this book is the second part, which consists of a quite masterly exegesis of the Passion-sayings, arranged according to sources: St. Mark, the Lukan tradition, 1 Corinthians, and St. John. It is preceded by a study of the necessary ideas without which the Sayings are not intelligible, such as the Kingdom of God, the Son of Man, the Servant, Sacrifice; and it is followed by an attempt to draw out

the ideas given in the Sayings into a theology of the Atonement.

The central point of the book is: " Jesus had a very definite ' theory ' of the Atonement. To Him the Cross was not an enigma, but the highway of conscious Messianic purpose " (p. 272). The use of the word " theory " means, not of course anything of the nature of systematic theology, but that there runs through the Sayings a very definite interpretation of the Passion. It is the task of criticism to sift the data given in the records, and mark down those elements which may be due to the witnesses and evangelists; this task is ably and thoroughly discharged here. On p. 81 there are some salutary remarks on the methods of modern criticism, which sees through the naive assumption of the nineteenth-century critic that " the narratives are reports and only the common element is genuine." Narratives must be judged by what they contain and not by what they omit. This principle is triumphantly applied to the Shorter Text of the Eucharistic Institution in St. Luke.

The result, briefly, is that, in sifting the Sayings, we are constantly brought up against an originality of thought which can only come from our Lord Himself. They are dominated throughout by a creative interpretation of the term " Son of Man " in the light of Isaiah liii. It was " His steadfast belief that the purpose and experience of His Passion lay deep in the Providence of God. He did not look on His sufferings as chance events, or as a stroke of fate, or simply as a tragedy compassed by men " (p. 255). There is no suggestion of any antagonism of will between Himself and the Father. His sufferings, death, and resurrection are interpreted " positively, as active elements in His Messianic vocation " (p. 257), and so as closely related to the Kingdom of God, which is to be established through His victorious conflict with the powers of evil. Thus His Messianic suffering is representative and vicarious, " on behalf of " men; " the ' ransom ' which He gives is something they are unable to provide " (p. 261). At the same time there is " a close personal relation between Himself and sinners, and in consequence a poignant experience of the consequences of sin " (p. 262). So, too, He intends men to participate in His self-offering and to appropriate the power of His surrendered life. This is seen most of all " in the Supper Sayings, which are absolutely vital to an understanding of the attitude of Jesus to His death " (p. 266). Thus, " though His vocation of Messianic suffering is unique, He none the less interprets it as an activity which in some measure men are to reproduce."

This last point leads on to the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

It is noted that in the Old Testament we get the roots of the conception of corporate personality, in the Servant of the Lord: " the mysterious barriers [misprinted in the text as ' bonds '] which separate one person from another are here broken down. Without loss of identity, the personality revealed is at once individual and corporate " (p. 284). We should like to see Dr. Taylor develop this point further, on the lines of A. M. Ramsey's *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (a book which is not mentioned). Another surprising omission is the lack of any allusion to the work of the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns.

The call to men to a share in the Passion appears in several passages, as in the command to the Three in Gethsemane to watch with Him, and other sayings at the Supper besides the Institution itself. But there is one notable omission, of the words about taking up the cross in Mark viii. 34-5. We should like to know if Dr. Taylor would accept the reference to the taking up of the cross here as original. It would seem that if it was added *ex eventu*, the meaning implied would be that the only true Christian is he who suffers martyrdom. Only if the words were spoken by our Lord much as they stand does the sense come out right: " He who would be My disciple must renounce himself, give himself without reservation as regards the cost, even if it should mean finding himself one day in a string of prisoners being led out to execution; and there he will also find Me."

This is a notable and even a great book. It ends in a way which is not at all usual for books on the Atonement, but which is, nevertheless, entirely right—with a study of the place of Eucharist, prayers and meditation as the indispensable means to the appropriation of the Atonement in the life of the Church.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

NOTICES

LIFE IN CHRIST. By F. P. Harton, B.D. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

Readers of *The Elements of the Spiritual Life* must often have wished for a simpler book shewing how its excellent teaching could be conveyed to the ordinary congregation. In *Life in Christ*, evolved, as he tells us, from two courses of sermons, Fr. Harton has met this need. Here in simple language is sound teaching on the spiritual life based on the great truths of dogmatic and ascetic theology. One's first impression was of dulness; for the first two chapters, "Sons of God" and "Members of Christ," failed to thrill one in the way intended. But one's perseverance was amply rewarded in the succeeding chapters. The teaching on prayer is confined to a dozen pages; but they are full of good advice. Admirable, too, is the chapter on mortification ("The New Man and the Old"). Throughout the book there is evidence of a wise and balanced judgment. We are warned off many of the familiar pitfalls; the danger, for instance, of mistaking self-will for the guidance of the Holy Spirit. "The movement of the indwelling Spirit is not by way of plenary inspiration and an automatic control of the human spirit" (p. 39). There is a timely protest against the current tendency to over-emphasize the corporate aspect of the Christian life to the belittling of individual piety; and against the exaggeration in some quarters of the doctrine of disinterestedness. "Human love always desires to possess, not because it is selfish but because it is what it is" (p. 110). And there is a firm insistence on the love of man as the necessary counterpart of the love of God. "One sometimes comes across very holy people who are as hard as marble and as cold as ice. . . . They have merely killed natural affection without arriving at supernatural charity" (pp. 118-119). It is strange that there should be no reference to repentance or to the sacrament of penance; but possibly the author's intention was to dwell only on the positive side of the Christian life.

C. MILLINGTON, C.R.

THE NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEM. By L. J. Collins. The Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d.

This book by the Vice-Principal of Westcott House is valuable, timely and welcome. After a discussion of origins, he gives us a guide to what New Testament scholarship has done, not to what it is vaguely supposed to have done—and this with a broad sanity which is refreshing. I do not know if many would willingly allow the stress which he gives to "infallibilities," either of Church or Scripture; it has surely been the lesser man's interpretation of such "infallibilities" which has hindered vision of the living Gospel. There are useful chapters summarizing Source-Criticism and Form-Criticism (though the latter is limited to appreciation of the work of Dibelius and Bultmann only). In the second half of the book he shews how, scholarship having given us what Easton called "Synoptic Perspective," the living Gospel is seen behind and through the New Testament writings. This is positive and constructive; we come back with clearer understanding to the living Gospel, and are

reminded of a phrase of Fr. R. M. Benson, "making us one with the energies of God."

So much ground is covered in the earlier part, in fact the whole range of New Testament study is paraded for appreciation, that we could have wished for two things, a brief analysis at the beginning of each chapter, and a bibliography under subject headings. There will be much that is new to the general reader; such a book list would enable him to go to the really important books to increase his knowledge; for what is mentioned only in footnotes often passes unremembered, and this is a book which is richly provocative of further and deeper reading—that is to say, in its right place in the Christian Challenge Series.

VICTOR SHEARBURN, C.R.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By K. E. Kirk, D.D. The Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d.

Let no one be deceived by the inclusion of this Commentary in the Clarendon Bible, which is said to be designed for "the elder pupils in public schools" (among others), into thinking that it can be neglected by serious students of theology. It is not suitable for school use, being rather an important contribution to theology, necessarily very detailed in its treatment of the fundamental issues. Indeed, the book is a striking example of the rule that progress in New Testament studies is best made by those who come to them from other fields. The Bishop of Oxford is an expert in Moral Theology; he has mastered the linguistic and critical data; but his special contribution is made in the understanding of St. Paul's *thought*. This is a Catholic Commentary. It puts the problems of faith and works, justification, predestination, etc., in a Church background; everything the Apostle says is addressed to the baptized, who are living the Church life. The conclusions are sometimes surprising, but only because we read Romans in the light of Reformation misunderstandings. Perhaps Dr. Kirk presses his points too hard at times, but his book is a notable contribution to New Testament theology.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

WER IST CHRISTUS? By Erich Seeberg. J. C. B. Mohr. Tübingen. M. 1.50.

A summary of this fascinating lecture may be helpful to our readers.

The picture of Christ won by research cannot be identical with that handed down by our Bible-loving ancestors. True, we have reacted in a conservative direction from our grandfathers—yet we have not become Catholics. The cleavage now is not between philosophy and faith but between history and faith, or rather dogma. Church Christianity has shewn itself both iron-strong and plastic. Catholicism and historic Protestantism maintain their position.

The old antithesis, Jesus—Paul, must be given up completely: the theological view of Christ was *received* by Paul, especially the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and in the new Covenant inaugurated by Him. But we are still faced by the gulf between the historic Jesus and the Christ of the Resurrection visions. If it is to be bridged by the consciousness of Jesus, it must be by Him as Son of Man (in the last

resort a Persian conception), not as Jewish Messiah; by His linking of Son of Man to the idea of suffering; and by His new conception of God.

Now "Son of Man" is part of the "Mythus." So is the Cæsar-cult. Christianity conquered because it brought the Mythus into history; it created a new idea of Man, namely a spiritual being, as seen in Jesus —God become Man.

Separation of Church and State in Germany would (1) intensify the cleavage of the two forces; (2) strengthen the international ties of both Catholics and Protestants; (3) weaken the influence of Christianity on German spiritual life. At all costs, the Church must come to terms with the Third Reich. The inner kinship of the two is closer than in the case of the Church and Democracy, the connection of which in recent history has been familiar.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus. By W. Straub. J. C. B. Mohr. Tübingen. M. 7.80.

Here we have one of the exceedingly painstaking investigations which we associate with German scholarship. Immense trouble has been devoted to the Parables of Jesus, which present difficulties in that we can never be sure which is original and which added by the community. Comparatively little work has been done on the rich variety of images by which St. Paul made his message intelligible to his hearers—partly of Jewish, partly of Hellenic origin. A painstaking collation of the larger commentaries would produce for the student practically all that is found here; but it is a convenience to have the work ready done. The rich many-sidedness of the Apostle's mind is impressively demonstrated.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

William Tyndale. By J. F. Mozley. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Mr. Mozley's full-dress biography of Tyndale has a topical importance, in regard to the celebration of the Fourth Centenary of the publication of the English Bible; but it has also an abiding value. A great deal of supplementary knowledge has been gathered since Demaus published his excellent little Life of Tyndale some sixty years ago, and it was a matter of some consequence to have it safely stored between the covers of a single volume. This task Mr. Mozley has most judiciously performed.

But he has done much more than this. He has added discoveries of his own: for example, he has established that Tyndale matriculated at Wittenberg in 1524; and he has shewn himself remarkably adept at the difficult task of tracing Tyndale's movements on the Continent. He has, indeed, carried the study of Tyndale a long stage forward. Furthermore, his sober, resolute, and careful history brings vividly before us the likeness of a true athlete of Christ, an independent thinker, a fine scholar, and a man of great simplicity and charity of soul. The narrative of the betrayal and martyrdom is almost intolerably moving precisely by reason of its profound restraint.

Mr. Mozley has made a contribution of outstanding value to our knowledge of the period. Attention may be drawn particularly to his handling of the historic controversy between Tyndale and More. Not

that he has said the last word about it; it may, indeed, be doubted whether the last word about that controversy will ever be said. But at least he has grasped the nettle boldly; he is quite unfashionably candid about More's limitations as a controversialist, and More's admirers will find that they have got to reckon with Mr. Mozley's judicial summing-up and with his final verdict.

Admirable as it is, this biography does not claim to be definitive. For example, there is still work to be done on the subject of Tyndale's place in the history of English political thought. But in two departments Mr. Mozley excels: first, in his zeal for bibliographical detail, which is unusually important in a study of this character; and secondly, in his very full and scholarly discussion of Tyndale's translations of the Scriptures. It may be confessed that Mr. Mozley's prose style does a little lag behind his learning; but it is always readable, and nobody who is interested in the history of the English Reformation should permit himself to miss this book.

C. H. Smyth.

The Authority of the New Testament. By R. H. Malden. Oxford University Press. 4s. 6d.

Dr. Malden offers to an educated reader a sane summing up of New Testament criticism of the more conservative school. Among the good points of the author's account are a refusal to define Inspiration, a denial that the New Testament can offer us a political, economic, social or ecclesiastical programme, and a firm statement that the New Testament was written by Christians for Christians so that what the writers assume is of equal value with what they argue. We may question Dr. Malden's chronology of the New Testament writings and his account of Gnosticism as primarily a Christian phenomenon. He refuses to accept the methods or findings of the "Form Critics." It is possible for us to accept Canon Streeter's theories with him and still try to get behind the documents. Surely the Form Critics are right in ascribing the preservation of Gospel material to the needs of the community. They cannot prove the authenticity of this material, but they do help us to understand how it reached the authors of Mark and Q.

F. E. Vokes.

The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels. A Critical Study. By B. T. D. Smith. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

"Of all the Christian tradition, it is perhaps the parables, with their kindly, intimate presentation of human character, their humour and their irony, which reveal to us most clearly Jesus of Nazareth." So Dr. Smith sums up his chapter on the history of the transmission of the parables. With this object he discusses the name "parable" in the Greek and Hebrew, the form of parables in the Old and New Testament, Rabbinic writings and folklore, the background of the parables in Palestinian peasant life cut off from the courts of princes and rich men, the teaching of the parables with regard to God's demands and God's love, trying to find the authentic words and teaching of Jesus.

A former critic referred to St. Mark's Gospel as a series of masterly miniatures in wooden frames. We may agree with him and with Dr. Smith in this. The Form Critics try to find what need caused the Church

to preserve its stories about Jesus. Dr. Smith tells us that the Church preserved Christ's words and, having little biographical interest in the Jesus of Galilee, forgot the circumstances of their delivery. Then they applied the words to their own problems and invented contexts. For example, Jesus spoke of the great love of the woman to whom much is forgiven. This parable was affixed by St. Luke to the story of the anointing of Jesus in the Pharisee's house, a story full of inconsistencies. Moreover, in the parables of the Patch and the Wineskins, says Dr. Smith, we cannot tell what Christ's meaning was. All we know is that the Apostles applied it to the impossibility of adding the new Christianity to the old Judaism, especially with regard to the struggle between Paul and the Jerusalem Church. This St. Luke makes clear by referring to the patch as torn from a new garment, spoiling a good Christian to make a poor Jew. We may perhaps follow Dr. Smith and the Form Critics in their theory that the contexts may often be artificial, but it is not necessary to reject them as certainly unauthentic.

Form Criticism makes great use of the rules to which scholars of folklore tell us folkstories conform, and Dr. Smith points out how often Jesus's parables conform to the "Rule of Three," "Rule of End Stress," "Rule of the Single Theme," etc. Is it, however, a good argument to say that Jesus in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen tells of more than three lots of messengers, and so breaks the "rule of three," using this to help to disprove the authenticity of the parable? Are verses to be rejected, too, because they do not conform to the general pattern of Jesus's parables? Dr. Smith says on page 224: "The originality of the verse may be doubted since here only is Jesus represented as Himself supplying the answer to a question at the close of a parable."

Jülicher raised the problem as to Jesus's use of allegory and denied that in His teaching Jesus made use of allegorical forms. Dr. Smith shews us how the later strata of the Gospels make greater use of allegory than the earlier. A certain passage, he says, is not to be refused because it is allegorical but because the interpretation presupposes a knowledge of the history of the Church. The result of his study is to reject all the allegorical passages.

Did Jesus differ from the Rabbis? Did He think of a Christian Church? Dr. Smith thinks of Jesus as putting new life into the old bones of rabbinic methods, but not of Jesus as founding a Church, the logical consequences of the existence of which could be foreseen.

Dr. Smith has shewn us very clearly how Jesus followed the teachers of His own times, how He used proverbs and gave them a new twist, how the parables, even in Greek, betray their origins among the simple folk of Galilee. He has shewn us the difficulty of the parables, the difficulty of the sayings such as "Salt is good" or of the interpretation of the Ten Virgins or of Dives and Lazarus. Dr. Smith will make us study the parables much more carefully, even if we do not agree with him in many of his conclusions.

F. E. Vokes.

The History of Primitive Christianity. By J. Weiss. Macmillan. 2 vols. 42s.

Johannes Weiss died in August, 1914, and his unfinished work, *Das Urchristentum*, was completed by Professor Knopp, and appeared in 1917.

What a noble book it is! Conceived on a grand scale, dealing with the whole problem of primitive Christianity, shewing unrivalled knowledge, acute insight, and often real spiritual perception—I can think of no similar book which remotely approaches it. Let no one be tempted to buy it unless he is prepared to give many weeks to its study. But if he is, then the book is well worth the money.

Considerable space is devoted to the Acts. We are warned at the outset that Acts is dominated by the artistic conception of the development of the Gentile mission from the primitive community, under the patronage of the Church at Jerusalem and the original Apostles. Christianity for its author is Judaism brought to its logical completion and become a world-religion in place of the old national religion sunk in unbelief and hardness of heart. The kernel of the book was probably written by Luke, the companion of Paul, before the latter's death. This was written for Roman readers who knew Paul personally, so no description of the Apostle was necessary. Chapter xxvii. and its immediate predecessors are dictated by the necessity of explaining to the Roman public, including Paul's judges, how this wonderful man came to Rome. The Acts as we now have it is a writing up of Luke's work. The Roman Church put Peter and Paul together, Acts gave literary expression to its verdict.

But the heart of the book is its splendid exposition of Pauline theology, which far surpasses anything elsewhere available. In fact a student could not begin his riper study of theology better than by mastering these superb chapters. St. Paul stands out as the supreme embodiment of a living faith which overcomes the world and yet his faith is wholly dependent on Christ. The sceptic will read on with admiration, "hoping it might be true." The believer will be confirmed in his faith. Needless to say, Weiss' own position is not orthodox; but repeatedly he points the way to a line of thought which leads to reconciliation of orthodox and modernist.

Much of the foregoing was written in 1921 and printed in THEOLOGY. I have repeated it now as a review of the English translation made by Professor F. C. Grant and his colleagues, in order to emphasize the permanent value of the work. It is so massive that the theological waves of twenty-three years have beaten up against it in vain. The footnotes of the translators, referring to later books, are most valuable, but only serve to illustrate how little needs to be modified.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVI

JANUARY—JUNE, 1938

PAGE

BARNES, W. EMERY 337
Bethune-Baker, The Christology of 205
BEVENOT, M. 140
Bible, The English, as Literature 325
Bishop Berkeley's Family 288
BLAKENEY, E. H. 325
Books Reviewed:

Destiny of Man. By Nicolas Berdyaev 55
Hymnody, Past and Present. By C. S. Phillips 239
Judaism and Christianity. By Various Authors 114
Matthew, Mark and Luke. By John Chapman 311
Origin of Russian Communism, The. By Nicolas Berdyaev 305
Personality Survives Death. Edited by Lady Barrett 241
Philosophical Bases of Theism, The. By G. Dawes Hicks 117
Priesthood. Edited by Hubert S. Box 308
Spiritual Direction. By Hubert S. Box 308
Wisdom of God, The. By Sergius Bulgakov 175

BRECHIN, Bishop of 308
BUTTERWORTH, G. W. 241
CASSIDY, E. L. 232
Christian Sacramental Theory and Practice 280
Christianity and Marxism 210
CLARKE, W. K. LOWTHER 110 166
Communicants, Manual of 1830, A 166
Correspondence 170
COUTURIER, L'ABBÉ P. 168
CRUM, J. M. C. 311
DANBY, H. 114
DE CANDOLE, H. 6, 54
Devotion at Communion in Christian Antiquity 6
Doctrinal Commission and the Sacrament of Penance, The 225
Easter Message in St. Mark's Gospel, The 224
EDMONDS, F. WYKEHAM 210
Epiphany and certain Radiant Poets, The 42
Excepting Clause in St. Matthew, The 27
Family Budget, A 110
Father John Evangelist 299
Feeding of the Five Thousand, The 87
FIRKINS, H. H. 167
Foundation of the Church, The 78
FRENCH, R. M. 175
GILPIN, W. P. 258
Gospels and the Early Church, The 270
"Greater than He" 167
GREY, ROWLAND 42
Grouping of Parishes 222
HEBERT, A. G. 14
HODGSON, LEONARD 170
HOLMES-GORE, G. 112
HORT, GRETA 305
In (into) the Name 236
INGLIS, G. J. 270
Isaac of Nineveh on Prayer and Practice 92
Key to Bible Study, The 215
KNIGHT, Bishop 222
LAMPE, G. W. H. 102
Lauda Sion 51
LEMPRIERE, P. C. 227
LESTER-GARLAND, L. V. 87
LIGHTBOURNE, F. C. 112

PAGE
LYTTELTON, DELIA 230
MARKHAM, ROGER 236
"Matthean Exception," The 51, 171
Maude, Mother Mary 92, 299
Member of C. S. M. V., A 224
MILNER-WHITE, E. 239
MITCHELL, W. FRASER 288
MORE, PAUL ELMER 71
MORETON, H. E. 53
MORRICE, R. J. 304
MORTIMER, E. C. 155
MURRAY, J. O. F. 78
NEWBOLT, M. R. 51
New Testament, The, Authorised and Revised 337
Not Thither Reunion 227
Notes on Periodicals 54, 113, 173, 237
OAKLEY, AUSTIN 265
Œcumenica 53, 170
Of the Imitation of Christ 301
OLDAKER, W. H. 348
PARKER, J. W. 199
PARKER, THOMAS S. 55
PASS, H. LEONARD 134
Pastoralia 232
Pentecostal Gift, The 341
Philippians iv. 2, 18. A Note on 112
Philosophical Necessity of Angels, The 112
Public School Religion 348
PITTENGER, W. NORMAN 71, 205
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T. 51
PROCTOR, W. C. G. 300
RATCLIFF, R. C. 117
RAYMER, R. RICHMOND 106
ROBINSON, W. 280
Rome and Reunion 14
Sacrificial Aspect of the Eucharist, The 134
St. Augustine's Theory of Kingship 102
St. John vi. and the Question of the Author 230
SAMPSON, ASHLEY 341
Sex and Marriage 172
Significance of St. Mark, The 37
Some Fundamentals at Edinburgh 140, 300
Some Religious Reactions in the Near East 265
STEVENSON, G. H. 37
TAYLOR, R. O. P. 172, 215
Time and Eternity 155
TINNEVELLY, FREDERICK 171
Translation of "Agape," Note on 304
Unity in Public Worship 258
Universal Prayer of Christians for Unity, The 168
Virgin Birth, The 199
VERITAS (C. H. N.) 301
WEEKS, C. A. 225
"Zoe" Movement 106

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher